

Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van
Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 122

ḤĀTIMĪ AND HIS ENCOUNTER WITH MUTANABBĪ:

A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

S.A. BONEBAKKER

North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, Oxford, New York, 1984

ISBN 0 4448 5568 8

aan de nagedachtenis van
A.J.W. Huisman

AANGEBODEN IN DE VERGADERING
VAN 9 NOVEMBER 1981

Abbreviations

‘Abdalqādir al-Baghdādī, *Khizāna*:

Abdalqādir al-Baghdādī, *Khizānat al-Adab wa-Lubb Lubāb Lisān al-‘Arab*, ed. A.M. Hārūn, Cairo 1387/1967.

‘Azzām:

Dīwān Abi ‘t-Ṭayyib al-Mutanabbī, ed. ‘A. ‘Azzām, Cairo 1363/1944.

Badī‘ī, *Ṣubḥ*:

Yūsuf al-Badī‘ī, *aṣ-Ṣubḥ al-Munabbī ‘an Ḥaythiyyāt al-Mutanabbī*, ed. M. as-Saqqā et al., Cairo 1964.

Bisāṭī:

ar-Risāla al-Ḥātimīyya wa-ḥiya al-Munāzara bayn al-Ḥātimī wa-‘l-Mutanabbī bi-Madīnat Baghdād, published as an appendix to Abū Sa‘d Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-‘Amīdī, *al-Ibāna ‘an Sariqāt al-Mutanabbī*, ed. I. ad-Dasūqī al-Busāṭī (this seems to be the correct vowelting), Cairo 1961.

Busse:

H. Busse, *Chalif und Grosskönig: Die Buyiden im Iraq (945–1055)*, Beirut 1969 (= *Beiruter Texte und Studien*, Band 6).

Blachère:

R. Blachère, *Un poète arabe du IV^e siècle de l’Hégire: Abou t-Ṭayyib al-Motanabbī*, Paris 1935.

Ibn Khallikān:

Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-A‘yān*, ed. M.M. ‘Abdalḥamīd, Cairo 1367/1948.

Materials:

S.A. Bonebakker, *Materials for the History of Arabic Rhetoric from the Ḥilyat al-Muḥādara of Ḥātimī*, *Annali dell’Istituto Orientale di Napoli*, Supplemento n. 4–vol. 35, fasc. 3, Naples 1975.

Miskawayh, *Tajārib*:

(Ibn) Miskawayh, *Kitāb Tajārib al-Umam*, ed. H.F. Amedroz, Cairo 1332-3/1914-5.

Mūdiḥa:

Abū ‘Alī Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥātimī, *ar-Risāla al-Mūdiḥa fī Dhikr Sariqāt Abi ‘t-Ṭayyib al-Mutanabbī wa-Sāqit Shi‘riḥ*, ed. M.Y. Najm, Beirut 1385/1965.

Sezgin, GAS:

F. Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums, Band II: Poesie*, Leiden 1975.

Suyūṭī, *Bughya*:

Suyūṭī, *Kitāb Bughyat al-Wu'āt fī Ṭabaqāt al-Lughawiyyīn wa-'n-Nuḥāt*, Cairo 1326.

Tanūkhī, *Faraj*¹ and ²:

Abū 'Alī al-Muḥassin at-Tanūkhī, *Kitāb al-Faraj ba'd ash-Shidda*, Cairo 1903–1904, 2 vols.; idem, Cairo 1375/1955.

Tanūkhī, *Nishwār*:

Abū 'Alī al-Muḥassin at-Tanūkhī, *Nishwār al-Muḥādara wa-Akhhār al-Mudhākara*, ed. 'A. ash-Shālījī, Beirut (?), 1391–1393/1971–1973.

Ta'r. Bagh.:

al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Kitāb Ta'rikh Baghdād*, Cairo 1349/1931.

Tawḥīdī, *Imtā'*:

Abū Ḥayyān at-Tawḥīdī, *Kitāb al-Imtā' wa-'l-Mu'ānasa*, ed. A. Amīn and A. az-Zayn, Cairo 1373/1953.

Tawḥīdī, *Mathālib*¹ and ²:

Abū Ḥayyān at-Tawḥīdī, *Mathālib al-Wazīrayn*, ed. I. al-Kaylānī, Damascus 1961; idem, *Akhlāq al-Wazīrayn*, ed. M. b. Tāwīt aṭ-Ṭanjī, Damascus 1385/1965.

Tawḥīdī, *Ṣadāqa*:

Abū Ḥayyān at-Tawḥīdī, *Risālat aṣ-Ṣadāqa wa-'ṣ-Ṣadiq*, ed. I. al-Kaylānī, Damascus 1964.

'Ukbarī:

Abu 'l-Baqā' 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥusayn al-'Ukbarī, *at-Tibyān fī Sharḥ ad-Dīwān (Sharḥ Dīwān al-Mutanabbī)*, ed. M. as-Saqqā et al., Cairo 1376/1956.

Wāḥidī:

Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Wāḥidī, (*Sharḥ*) *Dīwān al-Mutanabbī*, ed. F. Dieterici, Berlin 1861, reprint Baghdad, n.d.

Yāfi'ī:

Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. As'ad al-Yāfi'ī, *Mir'āt al-Jinān*, Hyderabad 1338–1340, reprint Beirut 1390/1970.

Yāqūt:

Yāqūt, *The Irshād al-Arib ilā Ma'rifat al-Adīb or Dictionary of Learned Men*, ed. D.S. Margoliouth, London 1926–1927 (vols. IV and VII, 1st ed.), London 1923–1931 (vols. I, II, III, V, and VI, 2nd ed.)

Zambaur:

E. de Zambaur, *Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam*, Hannover 1927.

Hātimī and his Encounter with Mutanabbī: A Biographical Sketch

Over a period of several years I have been collecting biographical data on Abū 'Alī Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥātimī, in whose *Hilyat al-Muḥādara* I became interested in connection with my work on the early history of Arabic literary criticism. I have also given attention to the collection of parallels between the poet Mutanabbī and pseudo-Aristotelian *sententiae* which often goes under the title *Risāla Ḥātimīyya* or *Second Risāla Ḥātimīyya*, and made an unsuccessful attempt to determine whether this collection was correctly attributed to Ḥātimī. When I published some abstracts from the *Hilya* in 1975¹, I felt that the few data which I had collected did not add much to the information that had been gathered and discussed by Afrām al-Bustānī and Muḥammad Yūsuf Najm² and to the observations by Iḥsān 'Abbās on Ḥātimī's personality as a scholar and literary critic³, many of which agreed with my own conclusions. I therefore decided not to add a chapter on Ḥātimī's career and his oeuvre. Recently, while putting together a memorandum on Ḥātimī for the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, I came to the conclusion that I could not expect to find additional material in the foreseeable future, and that I might as well publish my notes as they were, in the hope that they would be supplemented by the findings of others who had been more fortunate. The following pages thus leave many questions unanswered, but will, I hope, once more focus attention on a scholar whose surviving work has earned him a position of some importance among mediaeval critics as well as a minor place among Arabic prose satirists.

Thanks to the illustrious patronage of H.M. King Hasan II of Morocco and the generous assistance of Mr. Abdelhamid Berrada I was able to examine two manuscripts which are quoted in this study (as well as other important manuscripts which I hope to discuss in future studies), and to obtain microfilms at very short notice. I also wish to thank the Turkish Ministry of Education, the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan, the Vatican

1. In my *Materials*, see below, pp. 54.

2. In their editions of the "Second *Risāla Ḥātimīyya* and the *Risāla Muḍīḥa*, see below, p. 19 note 50 and p. 15.

3. I. 'Abbās, *Ta'rikh an-Naqd al-Adabī 'ind al-'Arab: Naqd ash-Shi'r* (Beirut 1391/1971), pp. 243–251, 253–270.

Library, the Biblioteca Universitaria in Bologna, the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin, the library of the Karl Marx Universität in Leipzig, the Forschungsbibliothek in Gotha, the India Office Library in London, the Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya in Cairo, and the University Library in Leiden for microfilms and photostats of manuscripts and printed texts in their possession. I am particularly grateful to Dr. D. George of the Staatsbibliothek, Dr. H. Claus of the Forschungsbibliothek, and Mrs. U. Sims-Williams of the India Office Library for valuable information on some of these manuscripts.

Two of my colleagues, Professor A.A. Ambros and Dr. M. Fishbein, kindly took it upon themselves to examine manuscripts of the “Second *Risāla Ḥātimīyya*” in Istanbul and Cairo. In so doing they made an essential contribution to my work which will greatly facilitate the preparation of a definitive edition of this text. I much appreciated an opportunity I had to discuss some difficult passages with my colleague Dr. Muhammad Eissa. To Professor R.S. Kirsner I owe corrections of style and some valuable suggestions. Last but not least, I wish to thank my friend Dr. Yasin M. Al-Khalesi who generously undertook the laborious task of typing the Arabic texts.

The full name of Ḥātimī as it appears in nearly all biographies is Abū ‘Alī Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Muẓaffar al-Ḥātimī. There is substantial evidence that the name of his father was al-Ḥasan, not al-Ḥusayn as in some biographies. Both the Qāḍī Abū ‘Alī al-Muḥassin at-Tanūkhī¹ (d. 384/994) who was a contemporary of Ḥātimī and the Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071), who received traditions from Ḥātimī through the Qāḍī at-Tanūkhī’s son, Abu ‘l-Qāsim ‘Alī b. al-Muḥassin at-Tanūkhī (365/976-447/1055)² give his name as al-Ḥasan. Two younger contemporaries however, Abū Maṣṣūr ath-Tha‘ālibī (350/961–429/1038) and Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. ‘Alī al-Ḥuṣrī (d. 413/1022), offer evidence that his father’s name was al-Ḥusayn, and the same evidence is found in one of the two Maghribī manuscripts of Ḥātimī’s *Ḥilyat al-Muḥāḍara*³ and in two of the numerous manuscripts of the second *Risāla Ḥātimīyya* (other manuscripts either give no name at all or give the name of his father as al-Ḥasan), but this information may be questioned at least in the case of Tha‘ālibī and Ḥuṣrī. To clarify this point, and to examine at the same time the much more important question of the authorship of the poetry attributed to Ḥātimī, it is necessary to quote the opening lines of

1. Tanūkhī, *Faraj*¹, II, 85 (*haddathanā Abū ‘Alī Muḥ. b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Muẓaffar al-Kaṭīb al-ma‘rūf bi-l-Ḥātimī*), ², p. 303 (reads *Abū Muḥ. b. al-Ḥasan* for *Abū ‘Alī Muḥ. b. al-Ḥasan*); idem, *Nishwār*, III, 14.

2. *Ta’r. Bagh.*, XII, 115. The traditions in question are in *Ta’r. Bagh.*, II, 214, 356; XI, 231.

3. See *Materials*, p. 4. The evidence from the second manuscript can be disregarded since the original first page is missing and was copied from the first manuscript.

Tha'ālībī's biography which in the Cairo edition of 1375/1956 of the *Yatīma* (III, 108) as well as in the Damascus edition of 1304 (II, 273–274)⁴ appears as follows:

محمد بن الحسين الحاتمي حسن التصرف في الشعر موف على كثير
من شعراء العصر وأبوه أبو علي شاعر كاتب يجمع بين البلاغة في
النثر والبراعة في النظم وله الرسالة المعروفة في وقعة
الأدهم وليس يحضرني من شعره إلا بيتان هما عنوان محاسنه وهما

(here follow two lines from a *ghazal* poem)

ومما اخترته لابنه قوله من قصيدة في الخليفة القادر بالله
أمير المؤمنين استهلها ...

Here follow two poems (the second of which is presumably addressed also to al-Qādir, who ruled from 381/991 to 422/1031) and a third poem addressed to Shams al-Ma'ālī [Qābūs b. Wushmagīr], the Ziyārid ruler (who ruled from 366/977 to 371/981 and from 388/998 to 403/1012-13).

This last poem ends the chapter.

Tha *Yatīma* passage is quoted by Yāqūt (VI, 501–502) and appears there in the following form:

محمد بن الحسن بن المظفر الحاتمي أبو علي ذكره الخطيب في
تأريخه ... وذكره الثعالبي في كتاب يتيمة الدهر فقال محمد
بن الحسن (so!) الحاتمي حسن التصرف في الشعر موف على كثير
من شعراء العصر وأبوه أيضا شاعر وأبو علي شاعر كاتب يجمع
بين البلاغة في النثر والبراعة في النظم وله الرسالة المعروفة
في وقعة الأدهم قال وليس يحضرني من شعره إلا بيتان ...

(the same two lines from the *ghazal* poem)

قال ومما اخترته لأبيه قوله من قصيدة في القادر بالله أمير
المؤمنين رحمه الله أولها ...

Yāqūt then quotes the first line of the first poem on al-Qādir.

It is tempting to suggest that the text of the *Yatīma* as we find it in Yāqūt is better than the text as we find it in the printed edition of the *Yatīma*.

This, however, would make it necessary to assume that Tha'ālībī

4. For other editions see C.E. Bosworth, "Manuscripts of the *Yatīmat ad-Dahr* in the Süleymaniye Library", *Journal of Semitic Studies* XVI (1971), 41–49; E. Rowson and S. Bonebakker, "A Computerized Listing of Biographical Data from the *Yatīmat al-Dahr* by al-Ta'ālībī", *Onomasticon Arabicum: série listing 3* (Los Angeles 1980), p. 12. It is very unlikely that the text in the other editions would be different.

believed the poems addressed to al-Qādir and Qābūs b. Wushmagīr to be the work of Ḥātimī's father (unless one reads *li-'bnihi* for *li-abīhi*), even though al-Qādir and Qābūs b. Wushmagīr belonged to the generation of Ḥātimī's children rather than that of Ḥātimī himself (al-Qādir was born in 336/947-8); such sloppiness is not unusual in the *Yatīma*.⁵ But we should also keep in mind that Yāqūt considered Abū 'Alī and Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan to be one and the same person. He may have accepted Tha'ālibī's statement that there were two Ḥātimīs, but certainly did not accept his statement that Abū 'Alī and Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (or al-Ḥusayn) were different individuals and may have changed the text accordingly. The picture is further complicated by a passage from Ibn al-Qifṭī's recently published *al-Muḥammadūn min ash-Shu'arā' wa-Akhhbāruhum*.⁶ This passage does not appear in the Ḥātimī biography in his *Inbāh*,⁷ though Ibn al-Qifṭī must have been aware that he was dealing with the same person:

محمد بن الحسن الحاتمي الكاتب أبو علي [حسن التصرف في الشعر
موف على كثير من شعراء العصر وأبو علي شاعر كاتب يجمع البلاغة
في النثر والبراعة في النظم وله الرسالة المعروفة في وقعة
الأدهم] وله كتاب حلية المحاضرة من أحسن الكتب وأجملها في فنّ
الشعر وله كتاب جبهة الأدب في أمر المتنبي وما جرى له معه
وله الرسالة المشهورة فيما أخذه المتنبي من كلام أرسطاطاليس
ونظمه في شعره ولم يكن شعره بالكثير فمنه قوله ...

(the two lines from the *ghazal* poem)

والشعر الكثير لولده وأكثر من يجهله ينسبه الى أبيه .

The passage inside the brackets was clearly based on the *Yatīma* and follows the text word for word. Ibn al-Qifṭī apparently shared Yāqūt's belief that Abū 'Alī and Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan were one and the same person. He also had no doubt that the poet he mentions in the *Muḥammadūn* was identical with the scholar listed in the *Inbāh* (III, 103) as Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Muẓaffar Abū 'Alī an-Naḥwī al-Lughawī al-ma'rūf bi-'l-Ḥātimī al-Kātib, since in both the *Muḥammadūn* and the *Inbāh* he mentions the *Jabhat al-Adab* among the works written by Ḥātimī and gives the *kunya* Abū 'Alī. It also seems likely that he knew the text of the Ḥātimī biography in Yāqūt (or the source used by Yāqūt)

5. Cf. *A Computerized Listing* (above, p. 7, note 4), p. 11. Evidence that Ḥātimī was acquainted with al-Qādir's entourage and perhaps with al-Qādir himself may be derived from the fact that he wrote a book on al-Qādir's secretary, Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Battī, see below, p. 56, note 204.

6. Ed. Ḥasan Ma'marī (Riyāḍ 1390/1970), pp. 230-231.

7. See below, p. 14, note 35.

as well as a biography based on the text as it appears in the printed edition of the *Yatīma*, since otherwise he could not have criticised the attribution of poetry to Ḥātimī's father. It is possible therefore that the text of the *Yatīma* as we have it now was current in the seventh/thirteenth century and was at least as old as the text which we find in Yāqūt. A second and perhaps better solution would be to suggest that Yāqūt found لأبيه in his text and concluded from this that we should read وأبوه أيضا شاعر. This seems the more likely since doing so would have made it possible for Yāqūt to assume that Tha'ālibī, while speaking about Abū 'Alī, meant the same person as Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan. It is curious that Ibn al-Qifṭī did not notice that the second sentence in his biography beginning with *Wa-Abū 'Alī* ... did not follow the first sentence. This could be an indication that he had eliminated the words *wa-abūhu aydan shā'irun* from Yāqūt. But other explanations for the discrepancies between the texts could be offered and we cannot reach a firm conclusion unless we find an author who explicitly takes issue with Tha'ālibī's attribution of the *kunya* Abū 'Alī and the name Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn to different individuals, since only in this way it would be possible to determine whether or not there is a likelihood that Yāqūt emended the text.

The question whether Ḥātimī actually had a son who distinguished himself as a poet cannot, of course, be decided unless further evidence is forthcoming. The possibility cannot be ruled out, for Tha'ālibī may well have believed – correctly – that Ḥātimī had a son and still have assumed – incorrectly – that the son's name was Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn. That Tha'ālibī was not too well informed about Ḥātimī's biography appears also from *Yatīma*¹ I, 85(= ² I, 136) where he mentions, probably quoting Abū Bakr al-Khwārizmī (d. 383/993), that Ḥātimī was among the poets who attacked Mutanabbī at the instigation of Muḥallabī, but fails to mention the disputation that took place between the two.

What emerges from a comparison of the three texts is (a) that both Yāqūt and Ibn al-Qifṭī believed the name of Ḥātimī's father to be al-Ḥasan, not al-Ḥusayn, and corrected the *Yatīma* accordingly (assuming that it read al-Ḥusayn), (b) that they believed Abū 'Alī al-Ḥātimī and Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥātimī to be one and the same person, and (c) that Tha'ālibī knew only two lines of poetry by Abū 'Alī al-Ḥātimī and that Ibn al-Qifṭī may have concluded from this that Ḥātimī was not a productive poet. One wonders whether this conclusion is supported by other discussions of Ḥātimī's work, or by quotations from it, which could have been known to Ibn al-Qifṭī. So far I know of only two sets of quotations, neither of which offers conclusive evidence. Tanūkhī's *Nishwār* (III, 14 and 26) quotes, on Ḥātimī's own authority, two poems, the first addressed to Sayf ad-Dawla, and the second to an unidentified *ra'īs*, perhaps Abu 'l-Faraj Muḥammad b. al-'Abbās b. Fasānjus to whom Ḥātimī dedicated his *Mūdiḥa*. And Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. 'Alī al-

Ḥuṣrī (d. 413/1022) quotes poems by Ḥātimī in three places in his *Zahr al-Ādāb*⁸. On pp. 237 and 300 he calls him by the name Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Muẓaffar al-Ḥātimī, and on p. 765 by the name Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥātimī. Elsewhere in the *Zahr al-Ādāb* and in its companion volume, the *Jam‘ al-Jawāhir*, Ḥuṣrī quotes from Abū ‘Alī Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Muẓaffar al-Ḥātimī a prose fragment in praise of the night⁹ and, on the authority of Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥātimī, some poems by others¹⁰. Finally there are passages where Ḥātimī or Abū ‘Alī Muḥammad b. al-Muẓaffar al-Ḥātimī is quoted as a literary critic, and some of these passages can be traced in Ḥātimī’s *Ḥilya*¹¹. Neither the *Zahr*, nor the *Jam‘ al-Jawāhir*, nor the *Nishwār* by Tanūkhī offer clear evidence that Ḥātimī was not a very productive poet. Moreover, Ḥuṣrī clearly identifies Ḥātimī, the poet and writer of prose *fuṣūl*, with Ḥātimī, the literary theorist and critic, and does not seem to know for certain whether the name of Ḥātimī’s father was al-Ḥasan or al-Ḥusayn¹².

Ḥuṣrī claims that his work was based on texts collected in the East in his own days. He knew Tha‘ālibī’s work and one would expect him to have copied Tha‘ālibī’s errors. He does not seem to have used the *Yatīma*; at least he does not appear to have quoted from it directly. However, on pp. 127–128 of the *Zahr* he quotes from the introduction of Tha‘ālibī’s *Siḥr al-Balāgha* where Tha‘ālibī himself mentions the *Yatīma* and indicates that he drew from this earlier work in composing the *Siḥr*¹³. In the paragraph that follows (pp. 128–129) Ḥuṣrī admits, in his turn, that he relied on the *Siḥr* in dealing with contemporary poets. It is strange, therefore, that Ḥuṣrī would not have noticed that Tha‘ālibī recognized the existence of two poets by the name of Ḥātimī.

None of the biographers mention the date of Ḥātimī’s birth. According to Yāqūt (VI, 501), Ḥātimī was born early enough to have been a pupil of Ibn Durayd¹⁴. Since Ibn Durayd died in 321/933, this would mean

8. Ed. ‘A. M. al-Bijāwī (Cairo 1372/1953), together with Ḥuṣrī’s *Jam‘ al-Jawāhir*. The poems on pp. 300 and 765 are also quoted by Yāqūt who states that he took them from Ḥuṣrī’s *Kitāb an-Nūrayn* (or *an-Nawrayn*). The *Zahr* was composed in 405/1014–1015, see the note in Bijāwī’s ed., I, 126.

9. *Zahr*, pp. 111–112.

10. *Zahr*, p. 181; *Jam‘ al-Jawāhir*, pp. 319 and 356 (the last poem could also be by Ḥātimī himself).

11. *Zahr*, pp. 597, 601, 983, and 1015; *Jam‘*, p. 167. For the passages in the *Ḥilya* see *Materials*, index.

12. Two of the manuscripts used by I. ‘Abbās for his edition of Ibn Khallikān (see below, p. 14, note 35) read *al-Husayn* for *al-Hasan*.

13. Another quotation from Tha‘ālibī in *Zahr*, p. 1035 (I owe these references to Dr. E.K. Rowson). On p. 128 of the *Zahr*, Ḥuṣrī lists some of the poets whose work he found quoted in the *Siḥr*, but Ḥātimī is not among them. The *Siḥr* itself was written between two editions of the *Yatīma*, see *A Computerized Listing* (above, p. 7, note 4), p. 9a and note 20. The text was published but is not available to me.

14. The only other teacher regularly mentioned by the biographers is Abū ‘Umar az-Zāhid, better known as Ghulām Tha‘lab (d. 345/956–7), see *Materials*, p. 17.

that Ḥātimī was born around 310/922 at the latest. But on p. 503 Yāqūt also quotes an autobiographical note from Ḥātimī's [*Taqrī'*] *al-Hilbāja*, a book which Ḥātimī wrote for Abū 'Abdallāh [al-Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad] b. Sa'dān, who was vizier from 373/983 to 374/985¹⁵, as a reply to a detractor whom he does not mention by name¹⁶. In this autobiographical note Ḥātimī claims that he was in the service of (*khadamtu*) Sayf ad-Dawla at the age of nineteen and quotes a poem in which he praised this ruler¹⁷. If we assume that Ḥātimī did not join the circle of Sayf ad-Dawla before the latter had established himself firmly in Aleppo in 336/947 (the year in which he concluded a peace treaty with the Ikhshīdīd Ūnūjūr) he would have been born in 317 at the earliest, which means that he was a child of four when Ibn Durayd died. The question is whether Ḥātimī's story about his early career can be trusted, since not only the description of his character by contemporaries¹⁸, but also the tone of many of his utterances in his *Risāla Mūdiḥa* suggest that he was given to unbridled self-glorification¹⁹. His claim becomes even more suspect when we consider that he makes the same kind of statement in the *Mūdiḥa*, trying

15. Not, as is often stated, till 375, see Abū Shujā', *Dhayl Kitāb Tajārib al-Uman*, ed. H.F. Amedroz (Cairo 1334/1916), pp. 85 and 102; Zambaur, p. 214; Busse, pp. 65, 239, 303 note 1, and 509–510. Ibn Sa'dān was a close friend of Abū Ḥayyān at-Tawḥīdī whose *Risālat as-Ṣadāqa wa-'s-Ṣadiq* was written at Ibn Sa'dān's suggestion. It was also at the house of Ibn Sa'dān that the famous discussion took place which became the subject of Tawḥīdī's *Imtā'*, see *Imtā'* I, 4, and *Risālat as-Ṣadāqa*, pp. 8–9; I. Keilani, *Abū Ḥayyān at-Tawḥīdī: Introduction à son oeuvre* (Beyrouth 1950), pp. 24, 42–44, 48, 51, and 56. Though Yāqūt says that the *Taqrī'* was written "for the vizier Abū 'Abdallāh b. Sa'dān", one cannot of course be certain that it was actually written during Ibn Sa'dān's brief rule. The full title, *Taqrī' al-Hilbāja*, appears in the biographies in Suyūṭī and Ṣafadī (below, p. 14, note 35), not in Yāqūt.
16. Two lines of satire on this *hilbāja* on p. 504. On the same page a *taḍmīn* based on a poem by Nābigḥa. According to Suyūṭī (*Bughya*, pp. 35–36), this poem was written at the suggestion of the poet as-Salāmī. Suyūṭī quotes this information, which is not in Yāqūt, from the same *Taqrī' al-Hilbāja* and it is therefore possible that this text was still in existence in his days. For the term *hilbāja* see Maydānī, *Majma' al-Amthāl* (Būlāq 1248), I, 435, s.v. *a'jazu mina 'l-hilbāja*. The biography of Abū 'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh (or 'Ubaydallāh) as-Salāmī (336–394/948–1004) is not known in sufficient detail to be of any help in reconstructing the biography of Ḥātimī. See Ṣ. Radīf, *Shi'r as-Salāmī* (Baghdad 1971), pp. 22–25, 39–45, 50–52. According to Radīf, Salāmī left his native Baghdad in 357 to join the Ḥamdānīd Abū Taghlib in Mosul (others suggest 360), that is after the death of Sayf ad-Dawla in 356. It is not likely that he visited Sayf ad-Dawla in Aleppo at an earlier date, in spite of a statement to that effect in Ghuzūlī, *Maṭālī' al-Budūr* (Cairo 1299), II, 176 (as quoted by Radīf on p. 40). He belonged to the circle of the Ṣāhib Ibn 'Abbād before joining 'Aḥud ad-Dawla in Shīrāz and followed 'Aḥud ad-Dawla to Iraq in 367/978 or 368/979. See also Sezgin, *GAS* II, 594; C.E. Bosworth, *The Medieval Islamic Underworld* (Leiden 1976), I, 77–79 and note; and Busse, p. 511 (read Salāmī for Sulāmī). The most likely assumption is that Ḥātimī met Salāmī in Baghdad some time after 367.
17. Poem ending in *dū*, not identical with the poem ending in *iyā* in Tanūkhī, *Nishwār*, III, 14
18. See Tawḥīdī, *Imtā'* I, 135; III, 126–127.
19. See also Salāmī's reaction to the *taḍmīn* by Ḥātimī (above, note 16) as reported in the *Taqrī'* (*apud* Suyūṭī, *Bughya*, p. 36).

to make us believe that at the time of the debate with Mutannabbī in 351 or 352 he was still a young man²⁰. A further reason for questioning the truth of Ḥātimī's report is that he himself quotes in the *Ḥilya* 'Alī b. Sulaymān al-Akhfash who died in 315/927²¹.

In spite of all this, I feel that the evidence is not sufficient to reject Ḥātimī's report about his age at the time of these various meetings. We know that the data in Yāqūt's collection of biographies are not always reliable. Moreover, Ḥātimī's *Ḥilya* does not support Yāqūt, since it quotes Ibn Durayd on the authority Abu 'l-Faṭḥ 'Ubaydallāh b. Aḥmad an-Naḥwī²². Though Ḥātimī quotes al-Akhfash directly in one of his *isnāds*, there is a second *isnād* where he quotes him on the authority of Abu 'l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī²³, the author of the *Aghānī*, and the state of preservation of the *Ḥilya* text is such that one cannot trust the text of the *isnāds* to be always complete and accurate²⁴. It is therefore quite possible that he was born at some time between 320 and 330 and joined the court of Sayf ad-Dawla between 337 and 347²⁵.

The autobiographical report in Yāqūt goes on to say that, at the court of Sayf ad-Dawla, Ḥātimī was treated as the equal of the grammarians Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī (d. 377/987), Ibn Khālawayh (d. 370/980-981 in Aleppo), and Abū 'ṭ-Ṭayyib al-Lughawī. Since Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī joined the court of Sayf ad-Dawla in 341/952, Ḥātimī cannot have given up his career with Sayf ad-Dawla before that date. It also seems safe to assume that Ḥātimī left Aleppo not later than 351/962, the year in which Nicephorus Phocas destroyed the city²⁶, but I have not found any further clues as to the number of years that he spent at the court of Sayf ad-Dawla. In any case we find him in Baghdad in the summer of 351/962 or 352/963 involved in a famous debate with the poet Mutanabbī²⁷ whom he could have known at the court of Sayf ad-Dawla²⁸.

20. See *Mūdiḥa*, p. 2, line 4 ff.; p. 3, lines 4–5; and p. 7, line 19 –p. 8, line 2.

21. See *Materials*, pp. 87–88.

22. See *Materials*, pp. 17 note 38, 40, and 43.

23. See *Materials*, p. 39.

24. See, for instance, *Materials*, pp. 43–44.

25. See below, p. 18, note 47.

26. According to the editor of Abū 'ṭ-Ṭayyib's *Marātib* (Cairo 1375/1955), pp. 5–6, Abū 'ṭ-Ṭayyib died in the massacre which followed, but the *Zubdat at-Ṭalab* by Ibn al-'Adīm to which he refers does not make any mention of Abū 'ṭ-Ṭayyib.

27. If it could be established that Ḥātimī left Aleppo during the massacre (which took place in Dhu 'l-Qa'da 351/November 962), then only the date 352 could be accepted for the debate. It would then be difficult to explain how he could have won the confidence of Muḥallabī in the six months preceding the summer of 352 if it is indeed true that Muḥallabī urged him to attack Mutanabbī in verse (according to the *Yatīma*) or to challenge him in this debate (as reported in three of the four versions discussed below, p. 16 ff. and 29 ff.).

28. In spite of Mutanabbī's assertions to the contrary, see *Mūdiḥa*, p. 11, lines 5–6, 13, and 22. See also p. 255, lines 14–15 of the shorter version which will be discussed below, pp. 15 and 18–19 (وهو يؤكد الأقسام ويواصلها على أنه لم يعرفني); and the texts of the same version as we find them in Yāqūt, VI, 507, line 9

We have seen that the *Yatīma* attributes some verses on the caliph al-Qādir and the Ziyārid ruler Qābūs b. Wushmagīr to Ḥātimī's son. Elsewhere in the *Yatīma*²⁹ we find some verses on Abū Naṣr Sābūr b. Ardāshīr (five times vizier of Bahā' ad-Dawla between 380/990-1 and 391/1000) attributed to "al-Ḥātimī" without specification of whether the father or the son is meant. Neither these verses, nor the verses quoted by Ḥuṣrī and Tanūkhī to which I have referred earlier, throw any light on Ḥātimī's career during the second half of his life. From the *Mathālib* (*Akhḻāq*) *al-Wazīrayn* of Abū Ḥayyān at-Tawḥīdī³⁰ it appears that he met Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Jarjārā'ī who had a short and unfortunate career as a deputy vizier under Ibn Baqiyya from 362 to 363 (but may well have held an important position at an earlier date)³¹, and that he may have been personally acquainted with the Ṣāhib Ibn 'Abbād. With Jarjārā'ī he had an interesting discussion on the relation between the panegyrist and his patron. On the Ṣāhib he made a brief and very unfavorable comment condemning him as a man with an utterly perverse character³².

From the introduction of a story in Tanūkhī's *Faraj ba'd ash-Shidda*³³ it would appear that Ḥātimī visited Egypt, but there is unfortunately no indication at which period of his life this visit took place.

All biographies agree that Ḥātimī died in Rabī' II 388/March 998. Some biographers give him the title *kātib*, and Ibn al-Qifṭī's *Inbāh* mentions that as a *kātib* he served the "chief amirs" in Baghdad³⁴ suggesting at the same time that he was mainly known for his career in that capacity and for his studies on common themes in literature (*wa-lahu taqaddumun fī dhālika wa-tamakkunun min 'ilmi 'l-ma'āni 'l-adabiyya*).

The above is all that the biographical dictionaries available to me offer as

(وهو يؤكد الأقسام ويواصلها أنه لم يعرفني) and Badī'ī's *Ṣubḥ*, p. 130, line 3 (ويحلف بالله أنه لم يعرفني); and the other two shorter versions (below, p. 29 ff.) in the Ambrosiana MS, fol. 4a, lines 5-6, the Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā', p. 254, line 6 (ومع ذلك فإن الرجل لم يعرفني); and Khafājī's *Rayḥāna* (below, p. 34 ff.), II, 422, the Berlin MS, fol. 42a, line 11, and the India Office MS, fol. 210a, second line from bottom (وقال لي لم أعرفك). It should be noted, however, that Ḥātimī makes no attempt to remind Mutanabbī of an earlier meeting at the court of Sayf ad-Dawla.

29. *Yatīma*¹, II, 293-294, ², III, 131-133. For Sābūr b. Ardāshīr see *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1st ed. (Leiden, 1913-1936), s.v.; Busse, index s.v. Šāpūr.

30. *Mathālib*¹, pp. 16-17 and 208-209, ² pp. 19-23 and 313-314.

31. See Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, II, 298, 309, 310, 313, 317, 320, 323; Tawḥīdī, *Imtā'*, III, 217.

32. I am not sufficiently familiar with the biography of Ibn 'Abbād to determine whether Ḥātimī's acquaintance with the vizier necessarily leads to the conclusion that he spent some years in Persia.

33. Tanūkhī, *Faraj*¹, II, 85, ², p. 303.

34. Cf the quotation from the Ambrosiana and Mecca MSS, below, p. 32, lines 24-25.

the main data on Ḥātimī's career³⁵. Some further details from these dictionaries regarding his literary output will follow. In most cases the data found in the *Yatīma*, the *Ta'riḫ Baghdād*, and Yāqūt are repeated, and where data are drawn from other sources they add nothing essential to the account by these three authors.

Until recently, Ḥātimī owed his reputation to two *risālas* which go under various names and have both the poet Mutanabbī as subject. The first was known as *ar-Risāla al-Mūḍiḥa*, *Jabhat al-Adab*, *Munāẓarat Abī 'Alī al-Ḥātimī li-Abi 't-Tayyib al-Mutanabbī . . . bi-Baghdād*, or simply *ar-Risāla al-Ḥātimiyya*. We find the title *Kitāb al-Mūḍiḥa fī Masāwī al-Mutanabbī* in Yāqūt (VI, 502), but when Yāqūt, two pages further, brings quotations from the discussion between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī, which is the subject of this *risāla* as we now know it, he speaks of a *mukhāṭaba* (and actually quotes the shorter version published by Bisāṭī which will be discussed below). Suyūṭī knows a *Mūḍiḥa fī Masāwī al-Mutanabbī*, but also a *Risāla Ḥātimiyya* which deals with a discussion between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī in which Ḥātimī brought out the instances of plagiarism in Mutanabbī's work. Ḥājjī Khalīfa (III, 312) mentions that the *risāla* dealt also with other shortcomings ('*uyūb*) of Mutanabbī's poetry and uses the title *Mūḍiḥa*. The title *Jabhat al-Adab* appears in Ibn al-Qifṭī's *Inbāḥ* and in his *Muḥammadūn* with a description strongly suggesting that what he has in mind is the discussion between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī. Strangely enough, Yāqūt in his *Mu'jam al-Buldān* quotes *sub voce* Kalwādhā³⁶ a passage from the discussion between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī and gives the title of the work as *Jabhat al-Adab*, not *al-Mūḍiḥa*. Finally, we find that Yūsuf al-Badī'ī (d. 1073/1622)³⁷ knows of a *Jabhat al-Adab* and a *Risāla*

35. Those I have consulted are the following: al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta'riḫ Baghdād* (Cairo 1349/1931), II, 214; Sam'ānī, *al-Ansāb* (Hyderabad 1382/1962), IV, 3; Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntazam fī Ta'riḫ al-Mulūk wa-'l-Umam*, ed. F. Krenkow (Hyderabad 1357/1938), VII, 205; Yāqūt ar-Rūmī, *Irshād al-Arīb*, ed. D.S. Margoliouth, vol. VI (London 1931), 501–518; Ibn al-Qifṭī, *Inbāḥ ar-Ruwāt*, ed. Muḥ. Abu 'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo 1369–1374/1950–1955), III, 103–104; idem, *al-Muḥammadūn min ash-Shu'arā'*, ed. Hasan Ma'marī (Riyāḍ 1390/1970), p. 230–231; Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-A'yān*, ed. M.M. 'Abdalḥamīd (Cairo 1367/1948), III, 482–486; idem, ed. I. 'Abbās (Beirut 1971), IV, 362–367; Muḥ. b. 'Alī al-Ḥamawī, *Talkhīṣ al-Kaṣf wa-'l-Bayān (at-Ta'riḫ al-Manṣūri)*, facsimile ed. (Moscow 1963), fol. 69b (Ḥātimī is also erroneously mentioned on fol. 62a among those who died in 338); Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Lubāb fī Tahdhīb al-Ansāb* (Cairo 1357), p. 265; adh-Dhahabī, *al-'Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar*, ed. Š. al-Munajjid and F. Sayyid (Kuwayt 1963), III, 40–41; Šafadī, *Das biographische Lexicon (al-Wāfi bi-'l-Wafayāt)*, ed. H. Ritter and S. Dederling (Leipzig/Istanbul 1931 – = *Bibliotheca Islamica*, Band VI), II, 343–344; Yāfi'ī, *Mir'āt al-Jinān* (Hyderabad 1337–1339; reprint Beirut 1390/1970), II, 437–441; Suyūṭī, *Bughyat al-Wu'āt* (Cairo 1326), pp. 35–36; Ḥājjī Khalīfa, *Kaṣf al-Zunūn*, ed. G. Flügel (Leipzig 1871–1872), III, 112, 312, 596, V, 79, VI, 166; Ibn al-'Imād, *Shadharāt adh-Dhahab* (Cairo 1350–1351), III, 129.

36. Yāqūt, *Mu'jam al-Buldān* (Beirut 1374/1955–1376/1957), IV, 478a. Cf. *Mūḍiḥa*., p. 56.

37. *Šubḥ*, p. 269.

Hātimīyya of which he fails to specify whether or not they were directed against Mutanabbī. The title *Risāla Hātimīyya* is used by Ibn Khallikān (III, 482) in the introduction to his quotation from the beginning of the longer version of the *risāla*, as well as by Yāfi‘ī (II, 437) who quotes Ibn Khallikān, but interestingly both state clearly that the title given to the *risāla* by Hātimī himself was *al-Mūḍiḥa*³⁸. The term *Risāla Hātimīyya* is used by Ṣafadī and Ibn al-‘Imād in terms clearly suggesting that it is again the debate between Hātimī and Mutanabbī which they have in mind³⁹. The last of the four titles, *Munāẓarat Abī ‘Alī al-Hātimī li-Abi ‘Iṭ-Ṭayyib al-Mutanabbī . . . bi-Baghdād*, is quoted by F. Sezgin (*GAS*, II, 488) in reference to a manuscript in Mecca, a manuscript in Cairo, and the shorter version of the *risāla* published by I. ad-Dasūqī al-Bisāṭī (or al-Busāṭī)⁴⁰ which was based on still another Cairo manuscript. The correct title, at least of the longer version which is preserved in the MS Escorial 772, is undoubtedly *ar-Risāla al-Mūḍiḥa* (or *ar-Risāla al-Mūḍiḥa fī Dhikr Sariqāt Abi ‘Iṭ-Ṭayyib al-Mutanabbī wa-Sāqit Shi‘riḥ* as it appears on the title-page of the manuscript). This apparently unique manuscript was published in an excellent edition by M.Y. Najm (Beirut 1385/1965). From p. 3, lines 12–13 of this edition it appears that the little *Jabhat al-Adab* was the result of a misinterpretation of a sentence in the introduction, though as we have seen it was used by some biographers⁴¹. There can be no doubt that the title *al-Mūḍiḥa* was chosen because it suggests a *double entendre*, i.e. “the *risāla* that makes apparent, discloses [the shortcomings of Mutanabbī’s poetry]” or, as explained by Hātimī himself (p. 4, lines 17–21), “the lacerating *risāla*”, referring to a type of

38. See Ibn Khallikān, III, 486, line 13; Yāfi‘ī, II, 437, line 6.

39. In his *Tadhkira* (in the India Office MS, see below, p. 35) Ṣafadī does not give the title of the *risāla*, but simply introduces it with the words قال الحاتمي. It is of course possible that on one of the pages preceding these words he has enumerated the titles of the texts which he intends to quote. When Ṣafadī, in his biography of Hātimī in the *Wāfi*, speaks about the *Risāla Hātimīyya* and mentions that it is “in one volume” he must have had the extended version, the *Risāla Mūḍiḥa*, in mind, since the shorter versions enumerated below (p. 29 ff.) are only a few pages long (Ṣafadī uses the same title, *Risāla Hātimīyya*, in speaking of the “Second *Risāla Hātimīyya*” without giving any indication of its size). Ibn Khallikān mentions that the *Mūḍiḥa* comprised twelve quires (*kurāsa*). Ṣafadī also observes that the *Hilya* by Hātimī (below, p. 54) was in two volumes.

40. As an appendix to Bisāṭī’s edition of the *Ibāna* of al-‘Amīdī (Cairo 1961), pp. 251–270. The title page reads: *ar-Risāla al-Hātimīyya wa-hiya al-Munāẓara bayn al-Hātimī wa-‘l-Mutanabbī bi Madīnat Baghdād*. It is not clear whether these two titles actually appear in the MS Cairo, Dār al-Kutub 2039 (a *majmū‘a* which also contains the *Ibāna*). The *risāla* is also quoted in its entirety in Yāqūt (VI, 504–518) and in Badī‘ī’s *Subḥ* (pp. 128–142), but it is not introduced there by its title.

41. The passage reads: فقيدته برسالة وسمت جبهة الأدب (i.e. the debate) وذهبت بها أفواه الرواة في كل مذهب.

head wound (*shajja*) by which the head or face is broken, that shows the whiteness of the bone, etc⁴².

In the introduction of the *Mūdiḥa* (as well as in two of the shorter versions which will be discussed later) Ḥātimī relates the story of Mutanabbī's appearance in Baghdad and how he offended everybody by his ill-mannered behaviour and his presumptions, including the Buwayhid, Mu'izz ad-Dawla and the vizier, Abū Muḥ. al-Ḥasan b. Muḥ. al-Muhallabī; both found it hard to accept that there were no men of letters in Baghdad who were capable of competing with Mutanabbī and challenging him in a discussion. This was particularly galling to Mu'izz ad-Dawla who was acutely aware of the fact that Mutanabbī had been a favourite of his arch-enemy, Sayf ad-Dawla (*Mūdiḥa*, p. 7, lines 2–3). This prompted Ḥātimī to try to meet Mutanabbī and engage him in a debate. When no fortuitous occasion presented itself, he sought out Mutanabbī in his own house and attacked him in the presence of his students who had gathered to attend the lectures of the great poet⁴³. The description of this occasion (especially the reception Ḥātimī receives at Mutanabbī's house) is perhaps one of the most accomplished pieces of caricature from mediaeval Arabic literature. We can be certain that the picture of Mutanabbī's behaviour and of Ḥātimī's advantage over his opponent is grossly exaggerated. Yet the description of the scene is so vivid that it is hard to believe that Ḥātimī's story is not in part authentic. Ḥātimī arrives at Mutanabbī's residence mounted on a beautifully harnessed riding animal and followed by a train of attendants. He finds Mutanabbī in the company of students who are studying some of Mutanabbī's own poetry⁴⁴. When Ḥātimī's arrival is announced, Mutanabbī hastily leaves the room in order to avoid having to rise from his seat (which is made up out of some worn out garments or cushions)⁴⁵ to welcome the visitor. When he returns to the room, he ignores

42. See E.W. Lane, *An Arabic English Lexicon* (London-Edinburgh 1863–1893), s.v. *shajja*; see also s.v. *mūdiḥa*.

43. Such public challenges of a teacher were by no means unusual. See A. Shalabī, *Ta'rikh at-Tarbiya al-Islāmiyya* (Cairo 1960), pp. 219–221; Munir-ud-Din Ahmed, *Muslim Education* (Zürich 1968), pp. 188 and 190–193. Cf. also Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā aṣ-Ṣūlī, *Akhbār Abī Tammām*, ed. Kh. M. 'Asākir et al. (Cairo 1356/1937), p. 11; I. 'Abbās, *al-'Arab fī Ṣiqillīyya* (Beirut 1975), p. 91 (referring to *Centenario della Nascita di Michele Amari* [Palermo 1910], I, 373).

44. The Ambrosiana MS (fol. 2a, line 1) which will be discussed below (p. 30 ff.) reads *shi'ri*, "my poetry".

45. It is characteristic of Ḥātimī's style in the four versions of the *Risāla* (the *Mūdiḥa* and the shorter versions that will be discussed later) to dwell lovingly on these and similar details, using a somewhat different description in each version:

Mūdiḥa, p. 9, lines 5–6: واجلسني (i.e. الجماعة) في مجلسه وإذا
تحت أخلاق عباءة قد ألحت عليها الحوادث فهي رسوم دائرة
وأسلاك متناثرة .

Ḥātimī's greeting, though the students in the room⁴⁶ try to give him a hint that he should give proper attention to so distinguished a guest. After a while he asks Ḥātimī in a most uncivil manner about the purpose of his visit, upon which, Ḥātimī says, "I bore down upon him like a

(on the margin of the manuscript of the *Mūdiha* there is the following addition or variant: (واذا تحته ؟) زيلوية لم يبق البلى منها الا رسوما

The text in Ibn Khallikān and in Yāfī'ī is the same as in the *Mūdiha* (the variant is not mentioned).

In the shorter version in Bisāṭī's ed. (above, p. 15), p. 254, lines 10–12, this sentence appears as follows: فجلست في موضعه واذا تحته زيلو مخلقة قد

أكلتها الأيام وتعاورتها السنون فهي رسوم خافية وسلوك بادية
Yāqūt, VI, 506, line 2 reads: زيلوية; Badī'ī's *Ṣubḥ* does not have this sentence. In the version represented by the Ambrosiana MS, fol. 2a, lines 6–8, and the Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā' (below, p. 29 ff.), p. 251, lines 9–11 we find:

... حتى اذا حاذيته ودخلت الى موضعه من زولائه (؟)
مخرقة قد أكلتها الأيام وتعاورتها السنون وهي رسم حالي
وطراحتين (sic) كانتا مع نوح في السفينة قد بقيت عليها أعلام
تدل عليهما .
... حتى اذا حاذيته ودخلت الى موضعه فاذا تحته قطعة من
زولاية (زولايه fascimile page of MS: مخرقة قد أكلتها الأيام
وتعاورتها السنون وهي رسم خاو (خاوى MS) وطراحتان
(طراحتين MS) كانتا مع نوح في السفينة وقد (قد MS) بقيت
عليها الأعلام تدل عليها

In the version represented by Khafājī's *Rayḥāna* (below, p. 34 ff.), p. 421, line 7; the Berlin MS, fol. 41b, lines 12–13; and the India Office MS, fol. 210a, lines 5–6, we read:

... فاذا هو على فرش بالية قد أكلها الدهر فهي رسوم
خافية
... فاذا هو على قطع زلاية مخلقة قد أكلتها الأيام
وتعاورتها فهي رسوم خافية
... فاذا هو على قطعة زلاية مخلقة قد أكلتها الأيام
وتعاورتها فهي رسوم خافية

For زلّية, plur. زلالي (from Persian زيلو), see E.W. Lane, *An Arabic English Lexicon* (London-Edinburgh 1863–1893), p. 1242c.

46. Ḥātimī emphasizes the lack of competence of these students, see *Mūdiha*, p. 8, line 13–p. 9, line 1. In the shorter version published by Bisāṭī, p. 254, line 17 and in Yāqūt, VI, 506, line 10, he speaks of the "rabble" (*za'nafa*) which he finds in the company of Mutanabbī (Badī'ī's *Ṣubḥ*, p. 129, line 9 uses the term *jamā'a*). So also in the Ambrosiana MS, fol. 2a, line 17 and the Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā', p. 252, line 1. Cf. also the reference to "clients" (*sāghiya*) on pp. 17 and 29 of the *Mūdiha* and to a "weak-minded youth" on p. 62. Ḥātimī makes an exception for a beautiful young Alid from Kufa who (in the *Mūdiha*, p. 12, but not in the other versions) opens the discussion (cf. Blachère, pp. 226–227).

torrent rushing down towards the bottom of the valley''. He chastises Mutanabbī for his lack of manners, his refusal to recognize him⁴⁷, or at least to draw appropriate conclusions from Ḥātimī's distinguished appearance. As he works himself into a frenzy he asks Mutanabbī whether he can lay claim to any form of distinction that would justify his arrogant behaviour, but finally he allows himself to be pacified by the other guests. He then questions Mutanabbī on isolated passages from his poetry, and attacks his work pointing out instances of plagiarism as well as stylistic and grammatical shortcomings, skilfully refuting all arguments which Mutanabbī brings forward in his defense. Muhallabī and Mu'izz ad-Dawla are greatly pleased with the results of the debate. According to the account in the *Mūdiḥa*, three further debates take place and the whole affair ends in Mutanabbī's flight to Kūfa⁴⁸. A shorter version of the *risāla* which comprises only a single debate between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī is preserved in the edition by Bisāṭī which I have mentioned earlier (see above, p. 15). It is also quoted *in extenso* by Yāqūt (VI, 504–518) and by Badī'ī in his *Ṣubḥ al-Munabbī* (pp. 128–142). This shorter version ends in a reconciliation which allows the two opponents to part as good friends. Badī'ī's text and the text published by Bisāṭī (but not the text in Yāqūt) even add a last sentence to the effect that Ḥātimī became so much convinced of Mutanabbī's merits as a poet that he decided to write

The shorter version published by Bisāṭī, p. 254, line 7; Yāqūt, VI, 505, line 14 (but not Badī'ī's *Ṣubḥ*, p. 129, line 2); the Ambrosiana MS, fol. 2a, line 1; and the Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā', p. 251, line 3 tell us that the meeting took place in the Rabaḍ Ḥumayd (Mecca MS: Maḥallat Ḥumayd). The *Khizāna* of 'Abd al-Qādir al-Baghdādī, II, 355, line 1, also locates Mutanabbī's residence in this quarter which is identified in Yāqūt's *Mu'jam al-Buldān* (Beirut 1374/1955) III, 25b and in G. Le Strange, *Baghdad During the Abbasid Caliphate* (Oxford 1900; reprint New York-London-Dublin 1972), pp. 15–16, 140, 147–148. According to Yāqūt, V, 202, lines 17–18, Mutanabbī stayed in Baghdad with his pupil, 'Alī b. Ḥamza al-Baṣrī. 'Alī b. Ḥamza later emigrated to Sicily and stayed there till the end of his life. U. Rizzitano, *Storia e Cultura nella Sicilia Saracena* (Palermo 1975), p. 175 suggests that it was this 'Alī b. Ḥamza who introduced Mutanabbī's poetry in Sicily.

47. Cf. above, p. 12, note 28. Ḥātimī makes no attempt here to remind Mutanabbī of an earlier meeting at the court of Sayf ad-Dawla. Since elsewhere in the *Mūdiḥa* (pp. 91–92) he praises Sayf ad-Dawla, it is unlikely that he purposely avoids mentioning his acquaintance with the ruler. Moreover the *Mūdiḥa* may have been written at a time when the rivalry between Ḥamdānids and Buwayhids was no longer an issue (see below, p. 52). It is possible therefore that Ḥātimī met Mutanabbī for the first time in Baghdad (but perhaps not before the debate, cf. *Mūdiḥa*, p. 11, line 22: **وأقسم أنه ينزع منذ ورد العراق ملاقاتي**) which means that he joined Sayf ad-Dawla after Mutanabbī had left Aleppo in 346/957.

48. I have not succeeded in finding any confirmation of this interpretation of the motives which prompted Mutanabbī to return to Kūfa (cf. the various interpretations suggested by Blachère, p. 229). See also *Mūdiḥa*, p. 3, lines 2–3 where Ḥātimī claims that it was Muhallabī's stated intention to try to make Mutanabbī feel uncomfortable in Baghdad.

another *Risāla Ḥātimīyya*, and that the two became close friends while Ḥātimī paid visits to Mutanabbī's residence⁴⁹.

This second *Risāla Ḥātimīyya*, to which the shorter version of the first alludes, may be the *risāla* comparing verses by Mutanabbī and pseudo-Aristotelian *sententiae* which is preserved not only in a considerable number of (sometimes beautifully calligraphed) manuscripts and in five printed editions⁵⁰, but also in the *Kitāb al-Badī'* of Usāma b. Munqidh (d. 584/1188)⁵¹ and in quotations in the Mutanabbī commentary attributed to 'Ukbarī (d. 616/1219)⁵². It also appears on the margin of the Mutanabbī commentary by a certain 'Abdallāh aṣ-Ṣiqillī preserved in the MS Istanbul, Veliyeddin 2688 which is dated 570/1174-5. Yet there may be some doubt about its authenticity, since biographies such as those by Yāqūt and Suyūṭī which offer a detailed list of Ḥātimī's oeuvre do not mention it. As far as I know, the first biographer to give an accurate

49. This final sentence runs as follows: قال الحامي ومن فضيلته وصفاً
ذهنه وجودة حذقه ما حداني الى عمل الحامية الثانية
وتأكد بيني وبينه صبة وثيقة فصرت أتردد اليه أحياناً.

This sentence occurs also in the *Ṣubḥ* (p. 142, lines 12–14: the only important variant is the omission of the word *ath-thāniya*), though a note in Bisāṭī's ed. (p. 269, last line) suggests that the sentence is not found in the manuscript of the *Ṣubḥ* which he used (see p. 253, note).

In Khafājī's *Rayḥāna* (below, p. 34), p. 427, and the Berlin (fol. 44a, lines 5–6) and India Office (fol. 211b, lines 9–10) manuscripts of the same text the sentence reads as follows: ثم وفدت عليه بعد ذلك فرأيت من فصاحته وحسن عبارته
ما حداني على عمل الحامية.

For the version in the Ambrosiana and Mecca MSS see below, p. 33. See also Blachère, pp. 221–225. On p. 228 Blachère mentions, probably referring to the above passage (the ed. of the *Ṣubḥ* from which he quotes is not accessible to me), that Ḥātimī paid several visits to 'Alī b. Ḥamza's house where Mutanabbī was residing.

Ḥātimī makes no mention of the earlier meeting between Mutanabbī and Muhallabī during which a debate with Abu 'l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, the author of the *Kitāb al-Aghānī*, took place, nor of a second meeting during which Mutanabbī had been expected to recite a *qaṣida* in praise of Muhallabī (see 'Abd al-Qādir al-Baghdādī, *Khizāna*, ed. A.M. Hārūn [Cairo 1388/1968], II, 355 [= I, 385–386 of the old Būlāq ed.]). Nor is there any support for Blachère's interesting theory that Mutanabbī avoided becoming closely associated with Muhallabī because he was hoping that he might eventually be reconciled with Sayf ad-Dawla.

50. Antoine Poulade in *Rāḥid Sūriya*, Beirut 1868 (quoted by Blachère, p. 268, note, and not accessible to me); *at-Tuḥfa al-Baḥiyya wa-'t-Tuḥfa ash-Shaḥiyya* (Istanbul 1302), pp. 144–159; O. Rescher, "Die Risālet el-Ḥātimīje: ein Vergleich von Versen des Motenabbī mit Aussprüchen von Aristoteles", in *Islamica* II (1926), 439–473; F.A. al-Bustānī in *Mashriq* XXIX (1931), 132–139, 196–204, 273–280, 348–355, 461–464, 623–632, 759–767, 854–859, 925–934. C. Brockelmann in his *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, 2nd ed. (Leiden 1937–1949) S I, 141, mentions an edition in the *Wasīla Adabiyya* of Ḥusayn al-Marṣafī (Cairo 1292) which is not accessible to me. This ed. is also mentioned in Bisāṭī's ed. of the shorter version, p. 270, note.
51. Ed. A.A. Badawī et al. (Cairo 1380/1960), pp. 264–283.
52. The work belongs to a younger contemporary of 'Ukbarī, see Sezgin, *GAS*, II, 495.

description of the *risāla* was Ibn al-Qifṭī (d. 646/1248) in his *al-Muḥammadūn min ash-Shu'arā'*, though the same Ibn al-Qifṭī fails to mention it in his *Inbāh*⁵³. Its attribution to Ḥātimī was known to the author of the *Hikam Gharība* who, according to W. Ahlwardt⁵⁴, wrote around 606/1209, to Ibn al-Athīr (d. 637/1239) who refers to it in his *Istidrāk*⁵⁵, and to Ibn Nubāta (d. 768/1366) who mentions it in his *Sarḥ al-'Uyūn*⁵⁶. It was also known to the author of the commentary attributed to 'Ukbarī (7th/13th century)⁵⁷. Of the unpublished manuscripts or fragments of the text known to me, six or seven do not have the title *Risāla Ḥātimīyya* or any other indication of the origin of the work, but only a descriptive title; nor does the name Ḥātimī, as far as I know, appear anywhere in the first of the two Mutanabbī commentaries or in Usāma's *Badī'*. The final sentence of the text in Badī'ī's *Ṣubḥ* and in the Bisāṭī edition may well be a later addition or may refer to another work by Ḥātimī⁵⁸.

These facts by themselves would not be enough to invalidate the attribution of the work to Ḥātimī. Nor need the difference in the number of parallels found in the various manuscripts and printed texts disturb us, since it is easy to imagine that many scribes would not hesitate to add a

53. See above, pp. 8 and 14.

54. See Ahlwardt's catalogue of the Berlin manuscripts (below, p. 23, note 67), no. 8364.

55. Ḍiyā'addīn b. al-Athīr, *al-Istidrāk fī 'r-Radd 'alā Risālat b. ad-Dahhān*, ed. Ḥ.M. Sharaf (Cairo 1958), p. 48.

56. Ed. Muḥ. Abu 'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo 1383/1964), p. 213.

57. 'Ukbarī, IV, 284. The same commentary (III, 345) also quotes a passage from Ibn Wakī' (d. 393/1003), a contemporary of Ḥātimī, in which Ibn Wakī' denies that Mutanabbī took the line

إذا كانت النفوس كبارا تعبت في مرادها الأجسام

(cf. Bustānī's ed., p. 276, no. 1) from Aristotle and instead claims that Mutanabbī drew his inspiration from 'Ubaydallāh b. Ṭāhir and other poets. Since there is no mention of Ḥātimī, the passage can hardly be used as evidence that the *risāla* was in existence in Ibn Wakī's days.

58. In the shorter version of the first *risāla* published by Bisāṭī, p. 260; Badī'ī's *Ṣubḥ*, pp. 134–135; and Yāqūt, VI, 510 (but not in the *Muḍīḥa*) we find a saying by Aristotle which, Ḥātimī believes, was versified by [Abū 'Uthmān Sa'd (or Sa'id) b. al-Ḥasan] an-Nājīm (d. 314/926) and then plagiarized by Mutanabbī. So also in the version (see below, p. 29 ff.) represented by the Ambrosiana MS, fol. 4a, lines 2–3 and the Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā', p. 258, lines 17–18. The version (see below, p. 34 ff.) represented by Khafājī, p. 424 bottom; the Berlin MS, fol. 43a; and the India Office MS, fol. 211a does not have the lines by Nājīm and lets Mutanabbī borrow directly from Aristotle. The saying by Aristotle and the lines by Nājīm are also found in the *Hilyat al-Muḥāḍara* by Ḥātimī (below, p. 54), MS Fez, Qarawiyyīn 2934, fol. 99a and the *Mawādd al-Bayān* of 'Alī b. Khalaf, MS Istanbul, Fatih 4128 (see my article "A Fatimid Manual for Secretaries" in *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli*, Vol. 37, pp. 295–337), fol. 158b. Of course this passage in the shorter versions of the first *risāla* only proves that Ḥātimī was interested in the sayings of Aristotle, not that he was planning to devote a special treatise to Aristotle and Mutanabbī. A further indication, however, that the two *risālas* are by the same author is found in the version represented by the Ambrosiana MS and the Mecca MS, where we see Ḥātimī using a saying by Aristotle to support his criticism of Mutanabbī, see below, p. 34 note 133).

maxim here and there that did not belong to the original collection whenever they felt that this maxim was reflected in a line by Mutanabbī. The number of parallels in the ‘Ukbarī commentary cannot be established without reading it from cover to cover, and I have not attempted to do so; on the margin of the Ṣiqillī commentary I counted 33 parallels in a hand different from that of the copyist of the manuscript, so that we can only be certain that they were noted down no earlier than 570, the date of completion of the manuscript (I made no attempt to determine whether there are also parallels in the text)^{58a}; in Usāma’s *Badī‘* the parallels are in the chapter on *al-ḥall wa-’l-‘aqd* in a separate section entitled (*wa-min dhālikā*) *al-munāqala bayn Aristātālīs al-Ḥakīm wa Abi ’t-Tayyib*, and there are 93 parallels (against 100 in the edition by Bustānī and between 78 and 98 in most other sources). More puzzling are the differences between the introductions that precede the lists of parallels and, in some cases, the absence of any introduction or even a proper title for this “Second *Risāla Ḥātimīyya*”.

At this time the only manuscripts that are known to me directly (from microfilms), or indirectly (from printed editions) are the following. I first list the microfilms:

1. Saray, Sultan Ahmet III 2578/1 fols. 1a–22b⁵⁹
2. Ambrosiana C 158, fols. 77b–84a⁶⁰
3. Ambrosiana N.F. F 301, fols. 1b–8b⁶¹

58a Several poems are missing from this commentary and it seems likely therefore that the text is incomplete; this would account for the small number of parallels quoted in the margin.

59. See F. Sayyid, *Fihris al-Makhtūṭāt al-Muṣawwara* (microfilms collected by the Arab League) (Cairo 1954), p. 471a. Sayyid lists on 471b, also as Sultan Ahmet III 2578, a manuscript with the same number of pages (23) dating from the fifth century. According to Sezgin, *GAS* II, 488, this is 2578/1, fols 1a–22b, which he too identifies as dating from the fifth century. The microfilm in my possession has the same number of pages (1a–22b); it shows a manuscript with a note on the title-page of which only the date 757 is legible (the same date as that given by Sayyid on p. 471a as the date of completion of the first manuscript) and which is probably not as old as the fifth century. This suggests that Sayyid either listed the same manuscript twice or gave a wrong number to a very old manuscript which happened to have the same number of pages. That there is some degree of confusion becomes even more likely if one keeps in mind that the MS Medine 548, which will be discussed below (p. 25) also belonged to the fifth century, at least according to Sayyid. It appears on p. 471a of his catalogue.

F.E. Karatay, *Top Kapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi: Araçça Yazmalar Kataloğu* (Istanbul 1962–1969), IV, 289, nos. 8442 and 8443, lists two manuscripts of the *Ḥātimīyya*, EH (Emanet Hazinesi) 1335 and A (Sultan Ahmet) 2578. The last manuscript must be identical with the manuscript of which I have a microfilm: it contains, in addition to the *Ḥātimīyya* but in a different handwriting, a text of the *Mu‘allaqāt* and the incipit, as quoted by Karatay, is the same as in my microfilm. The MS EH 1335 is identified by Karatay as a manuscript dating from the ninth/fifteenth century.

60. E. Griffini, *Catalogo dei manoscritti arabi di nuovo fondo della Biblioteca Ambrosiana di Milano* (Roma 1916–1919), p. 627.

61. Not yet catalogued (?), cf. Levi Della Vida (next note), p. xxi.

4. Vatican 1375, fols. 103a–106a⁶²

5. Bibliothèque Nationale 3019, fols. 181a–199a⁶³

As far as I can see, the texts in these manuscripts are all part of *majmū‘a*’s. The Sultan Ahmet MS contains 100 parallels; the MS Ambrosiana C 158 has 92 parallels; the Vatican MS has 72 parallels; and the Bibliothèque Nationale MS has 49 parallels. The MS Ambrosiana N.F. F 300 has only 34 parallels, but it is incomplete; according to the text of the same version published by Shammā‘ which is listed below under (11) there should have been 93.

The following manuscripts have been published in printed editions or are known from the apparatus of the Bustānī edition (above, p. 19, note 50):

6. Ayasofya 3582/3 published in facsimile by Rescher (above, p. 19, note 50). It has 98 parallels.

7. an unidentified MS on which the first edition by Poulade (above, p. 19, note 50) was based. This edition was used by Bustānī in preparing his own edition. He refers to it as ت (see pp. 200 and 201 of Bustānī’s ed.; see also pp. 273 and 933). It has 79 parallels.

8. Aşir Efendi (Reisülküttap) 1190/6. The edition in the *Tuhfa* was based on this manuscript (according to the introduction to Rescher’s ed., p. 439). This *Tuhfa* edition was also used by Bustānī who refers to it as ق (see pp. 201, 273, and 933 of Bustānī’s ed.). The date is 644 and there are 97 parallels⁶⁴.

9. and 10. Beirut, Université St. Joseph, 341/1 and 342 used by Bustānī as the basis for his edition. Bustānī refers to these manuscripts as م and ر (see p. 273) and offers a detailed description on pp. 202–204. There are 98 and 99 parallels respectively (see also p. 933).

11. Mecca, Ḥaram, Adab 255/5, listed by Sezgin and recently edited by H.M. Shammā‘⁶⁵. It has 93 parallels.

Of the manuscripts listed below (some of which offer no more than quotations from the *Risāla*) I have acquired microfilms only recently. I have not attempted to compare them in detail to the five manuscripts listed earlier and to the printed editions:

12. Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria 3023, fols. 15b–23a⁶⁶

62. G. Levi Della Vida, *Elenco dei manoscritti arabi islamici della Biblioteca Vaticana* (Vatican 1935), p. 211.

63. G. Vadjia, *Index général des manuscrits arabes musulmans de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris* (Paris 1953), p. 417.

64. See the article by Rescher in *Islamica* (above, p. 19, note 50). Bustānī and Sezgin confirm this date and Sezgin indicates that the text of the *Risāla Ḥātīmiyya* covers fols. 72–96.

65. See Sezgin, *GAS*, II, 488. Sezgin identifies this text with the text published by Bisāṭī (see above, p. 15); we shall see later (below, p. 29 ff.) that it is a separate version which combines the “first” and the “second” *risāla*.

66. See V. Rosen, “Remarques sur les manuscrits orientaux de la collection Marsigli a Bologne”, *Memorie dell’ Accademia dei Lincei*, ser. 3a, XIII (1883–1884), 163–295 under no. 447.2 (?; this catalogue is not accessible to me).

13. Berlin, Peterm. I, 183, fols. 123b–124a⁶⁷
 14. Berlin, Wetzstein II, 1229, fols. 44b–48b⁶⁸
 15. Berlin, Wetzstein II, 1266, fols. 84b–86a⁶⁹
 16. Berlin, Wetzstein II, 1555, fol. 205a⁷⁰
 17. Berlin, Wetzstein II, 1752/5, fols. 63a–70a⁷¹
 18. Berlin, Ms. Or. oct 2962, fols. 78a–81a⁷²
 19. Gotha, Ms. orient. A 1, fols. 3b–8a⁷³
 20. Gotha, Ms. orient. A 29, fols. 174b–176a
 21. Gotha, Ms. orient. A 2234, fols. 1a–17a
 22. Leipzig, Vollers 857/2, fols. 47a–54b⁷⁴
 23. Dār al-Kutub, Ṭal‘at 530 (twenty-three unnumbered pages)
 24. Uncatalogued (?) MS in the Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya listed as no. 35363 (thirty-nine unnumbered pages)
 25. Dimyāt, al-Ma‘had ad-Dīnī⁷⁵, fols 364a–373a
- The Bologna manuscript gives the title as *ar-Risāla al-Ḥātimīyya*, but does not have the name of the author in the introduction or in the colophon (see below, p. 28, note 93). I counted 95 parallels.
- The MSS Peterm. I, 183, Wetzstein II, 1229, and Wetzstein II, 1266

67. The text is part of a world history with the title ‘*Umdat al-‘Ārifin*. This manuscript, as well as the five manuscripts that follow, are located in the Orientabteilung der Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin. They have been described in W. Ahlwardt, *Verzeichniss der arabischen Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, Berlin 1887–1899 (this manuscript is listed as no. 9492), except the last manuscript which is a later acquisition.
68. Cf. Ahlwardt, no. 8364: The text is part of a work with the title *al-Ḥikam al-Gharība fi ‘l-‘Ibārāt al-‘Ajība* by a unknown author who was alive in 606/1209.
69. Cf. Ahlwardt, no. 3906. The text is part of a *majmū‘a* that has no title of its own and contains sections in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish. The MS dates from approx. 1200/1785.
70. Cf. Ahlwardt, no. 3695. The text is part of a *majmū‘a* (?) dated 785/1383.
71. Cf. Ahlwardt, no. 9797. The text is part of a *majmū‘a* which begins with a work that was copied in 1138/1725.
72. See *Verzeichniss der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, Band XVII, Reihe B: E. Wagner, *Arabische Handschriften*, Teil I, p. 445, lines 2–4. The *risāla* appears in a collection which was apparently composed for private use by a certain Kūz b. Anṭūn. Its title is *Majmū‘ az-Zahr al-‘Ātir li-Inshirāḥ al-Khātir* and the MS is an autograph dated Aleppo 1780.
73. Both the MS A 1 and the MS A 29 are *majmū‘as*. The catalogue by W. Pertsch is not available to me and I owe this information to the courtesy of Dr. H. Claus, Director of the Forschungsbibliothek Gotha, Schlosz Friedenstein.
74. See K. Vollers, *Katalog der islamischen, etc. Handschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Leipzig* (Leipzig 1906), p. 285. The MS dates from 1006/1597–1598 and also contains the *Kitāb as-Siyāsa fi ‘Ilm al-Firāsa* of Abū ‘Abdallāh b. Abī Ṭālib.
75. See *Majallat Ma‘had al-Makhtūṭāt al-‘Arabiyya* (*Revue de l’Institut des Manuscrits Arabes*) III, 2 (Cairo 1957), p. 344, last line: *ar-Risāla al-Ḥātimīyya li-‘l-Ḥātimī, nuskhā min al-qarn as-sādis*. The Dār al-Kutub in Cairo has two photocopies of this manuscript, one catalogued as Adab 5168 and the other as Adab 7196. The photographs were examined by Dr. M. Fishbein who also copied the introduction for me. The manuscript has no date and presumably no title page.

contain abstracts from the *risāla*. The first mentions, in the context of a discussion on the works of Aristotle, that Mutanabbī borrowed from this philosopher and then offers examples (I counted only 13) taken from a *Kitāb an-Naẓā'ir* of which it does not mention the author and which, in its complete form, contained hundred *ḥikmas*. The second mentions that Ḥātīmī compared Aristotle to Mutanabbī, but does not give the title of Ḥātīmī's book. It offers 56 parallels, if I counted them correctly. The third consists of a few closely written pages of notes taken from a *Manāqil bayn al-Mutanabbī wa-'l-Ḥakīm Arisṭū* without specification of the author. I counted 78 maxims and it therefore contains the complete text or a substantial portion of it. The MS Wetzstein II, 1555, fol. 205a contains only two parallels without indication of their origin. The two remaining Berlin manuscripts offer what appears to be the complete *risāla*, since there is also an introduction, and indicate the name of the author without a clear indication of what the title should be. I counted 93 and 78 parallels respectively.

The MS Gotha A 29 is again an abstract of 12 parallels entitled *Kalām al-Ḥakīm Arisṭātālīs nathran wa-Abi 't-Ṭayyib al-Mutanabbī naẓman* without mention of the name of the author. The MS A1 has no title, but gives the name of the author (*ash-shaykh al-imām al-'ālīm al-awḥad al-Ḥātīmī*) in the introduction. I counted 81 parallels.

The MS Gotha A 2234 is in a category by itself, since along with the versifications by Mutanabbī of Aristotle's *sententiae*, it also offers versifications of the same *sententiae* by a certain ar-Riyāḍī whom I have not succeeded in identifying⁷⁶. It has 93 parallels, a number that is also found in some of the other versions, but no introduction. The title is *Kitāb al-Ḥātimiyya* (sic). There is no colophon; the handwriting suggests that it is a manuscript of recent date.

The Leipzig MS has no title, but gives the name of the author in the introduction. I counted 83 parallels.

Information on three manuscripts in Egypt was provided by my colleague, Dr. M. Fishbein, who also helped me to obtain photostats. The Ṭal'at MS and (presumably) the Dimyāṭ MS have no title page. The Ṭal'at MS gives the name of the author in the introduction and the title, *Risāla Ḥātimiyya*, in the colophon. The Dimyāṭ MS has an introduction, but does not give the name of the author (I have no information on the colophon). The MS 35363 of the Dār al-Kutub has a title-page which contains the names of Abū 'Alī Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (?) and al-Ḥakīm (?) Arisṭālīs (sic), both partially obliterated by a library stamp (Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya: Qism at-Taymūriyya?); above these two names we find in what may be a different handwriting:

76. C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, 2nd ed. (Leiden 1937–1949), G I, 88, mentions this manuscript, but was apparently also unsuccessful in his attempts to identify the second poet.

عن كتاب الحكم مأثور عن . In the Ṭal‘at MS I counted 94 parallels and in the MS 35363 of the Dār al-Kutub 87. I have no information on the number of parallels in the Dimyāṭ MS.

Finally I have a few notes on a manuscript in Istanbul, the MS Saray, Medine 548; these notes were provided by Professor A.A. Ambros who kindly took time off from a busy schedule and managed to examine the manuscript very briefly. There is no title or introduction and it is likely that one or two folios are missing⁷⁷. (The manuscript is clearly part of a *majmū‘a*; the last page of the preceding text contains a *samā‘* note dated 23 Rabī‘ I, 655, but this *samā‘* note is in a different handwriting.) The colophon contains only a doxology preceded by: عورض جميعها بالأصل . فصح ان شاء الله تمت الرسالة والحمد لله ... There are over 70 parallels.⁷⁷

Of the following manuscripts there exist brief descriptions in catalogues or periodicals. These descriptions do not suggest that they offer any new information on the history of the text or the identity of its author (except perhaps the Ṣan‘a MS), though it is impossible to draw definite conclusions:

Ayasofya 4013⁷⁸

Ayasofya 4014

Aṣīr Efendi (Reisülküttap) 1163/11

Aṣīr Efendi (Reisülküttap) 1164⁷⁹

Fatih 5323⁸⁰

77. According to F. Sayyid, *Fihris al-Makhtūtāt al-Muṣawwara* (above, p. 21, note 59), p. 471a, the manuscript was copied in 479 by a certain Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. Makkī b. Muḥassin al-Qayrawānī. Sezgin, *GAS* II, 488 must have seen this manuscript since he indicates the page numbers; but he fails to note that it has no date and not even a title or introduction, even though the description in Sayyid’s catalogue was known to him. If there is still an old manuscript in existence that was wrongly listed by Sayyid and overlooked by Sezgin, it would obviously be interesting to know whether the author is identified there as Ḥātimī, since the oldest attribution dates, as we have seen, from the late sixth or early seventh century (above, pp. 19–20 and 23, note 68).

78. See O. Rescher in *Wiener Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenl.*, XXVI (1912), 64–65. Here Rescher suggests that Ayasofya 4013 was used in the *Tuḥfa* edition, though later in his own edition in *Islamica* II (1926), 439 he identified as such the MS Aṣīr Efendi 1190. The manuscript is dated 786.

79. In the *Islamica* article (p. 439) Rescher describes these manuscripts in the following terms: “Was die übrigen Mss. (Aja Sofja 4013/14 und ‘Āṣīr-Ef. 1163/4) anlangt, so kommen diese – weil z.T. späteren Datums, z.T. weniger komplett – hier nicht weiter in Frage”. Sezgin, *GAS*, II, 488 gives the number of the third manuscript as 1163/11, the folio nos. as 175–80, and the date as 789. See also next note.

80. See Rescher in *Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Ges.*, LXVIII (1914), 387 and note 5. Rescher indicates that in 1164 we have the same *Risāla Ḥātimiyya* that also exists in 1163, and mentions one more manuscript in Fatih 5323. In the same *majmū‘a* there is a *Kitāb al-Itisā‘* by Aristotle copied in 850.

Mosul, Ḥasaniyya⁸¹

Şan'a, Imām Yaḥyā 61⁸²

Algiers, Bibliothèque du Musée⁸³

Dār al-Kutub, Adab 2803⁸⁴

Saray, E.H. (Emanet Hazinesi) 1335⁸⁵

Sezgin (*GAS*, II, 488) lists several other manuscripts and suggests that some of these may turn out to be copies of the shorter version of the *Risāla Mūdiḥa* (i.e. the version published by Bisāṭī which is also quoted in Badī'ī's *Ṣubḥ* and in Yāqūt) rather than manuscripts of the "Second *Risāla Ḥātimiyya*". Finally 'Addal'azīz al-Maymanī points out the existence of a manuscript in the library (the Āṣafiyya) in Hyderabad⁸⁶.

I offer here a few observations on the texts of the "Second *Risāla Ḥātimiyya*" that are accessible to me in print or in microfilm, limiting myself for the time being to the introductions. A complete description would, of course, have to include a comparison between the numbers of parallels in the different versions and, if possible, a stemma showing how these different versions are related⁸⁷. Attempts I made several years ago on the basis of the first ten texts listed above yielded no clear results, and I decided to abandon them till I could obtain microfilms of the other manuscripts, especially the manuscripts dating from the seventh century and earlier. In the introduction to his edition published in *Islamica*, Rescher observes that the similarity between Aristotelian maxims and Mutanabbī quotations is not always very convincing, and it would be

81. See Dāwūd Āṣafī, *Kitāb Makḥṭūṭāt al-Mawṣil* (Baghdad 1346/1927), p. 128, no. 108. The manuscript is part of a *majmū'a*. The title is indicated as *Risālat Abī 'Alī al-Ḥātīmī al-Baghḍādī fīmā atā bihi al-Mutanabbī fī abyāthihi min al-ḥikam muwāfiqan li-aqwāl Aristāṭālīs*.
82. See ['A.] al-Maghribī, *Makḥṭūṭāt Yamāniyya fī Khizānat Kutub al-Imām Yaḥyā*, in *Majallat al-Majma' al-'Ilmī al-'Arabī*, XXVIII (1953), 132. The manuscript is part of a *majmū'a*. The title is indicated as *ar-Risāla al-Ḥātimiyya fī mā akḥadhahu al-Mutanabbī min kalām al-ḥukamā' (!) wa-adkhalahu fī shi'rīh*.
83. See E. Fagnan, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France, Départements-tome XVIII: Alger* (Paris 1893), p. 148. The manuscript probably dates from the 7th/13th century.
84. Listed in the old catalogue (*Fihris al-Kutub al-'Arabiyya al-Mawjūda bi-'d-Dār*), Vol. III (Cairo 1926), p. 165, but not in the new catalogue (1973). I owe this information to Dr. M. Fishbein. A search in the stacks failed to bring this manuscript to light.
85. See above, p. 21, note 59. Sezgin, *GAS*, II, 488 lists as Emanet 1355 a manuscript from the eighth/fifteenth century which is perhaps identical with the manuscript mentioned by Karatay.
86. 'A. al-Maymanī ar-Rajkūtī, *Ziyādāt Dīwān Shi'r al-Mutanabbī* (Cairo 1346), p. 13.
87. I may undertake this task at some future time. At present I feel that it is not feasible, and perhaps not worthwhile, to consider preparing a new edition of the text which, of course, would justify the trouble of preparing a more accurate description. For the same reason I have not attempted to offer a full list of references for the manuscripts to which I have had access.

interesting to see if this is also true of the earliest versions which might well contain a much smaller number of parallels. Moreover I felt that a study of this kind should include a list of those maxims that appear also in other collections of *sententiae* of supposedly Greek origin (in identifying such cases my attempts had been partially successful)⁸⁸, and a comparison between the *Risāla Ḥātimīyya* and *risālas* on similar themes, such as the *Kitāb Muḍāḥāt Amthāl Kitāb Kalīla wa-Dimna bimā Ashbahahā min Ash'ār al-'Arab* of Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Yamanī⁸⁹ and the *Amthāl Sā'ira min Shi'r al-Mutanabbī* of the Ṣāhib Ibn 'Abbād⁹⁰, both contemporaries of Mutanabbī and Ḥātimī.

Most texts and abstracts of the "Second *Risāla Ḥātimīyya*" are without an introduction; those that do have an introduction, give it in different forms:

A. A long version represented by 1, 8, 9, 10, 17, 22, 23 and 25 of the above list. We have seen that this version has been reproduced in the *Tuhfa* edition and in the edition by Bustānī. It consists of three parts: (a) an exposition on "justice" or "impartiality" (*'adl*), which is perhaps intended to justify the favorable judgement which the author expresses here on Mutanabbī as compared to the severe criticism expressed in the *Mūḍiḥa* and in the shorter versions of the *Mūḍiḥa* or, more likely, to give additional weight to his motive for writing a *risāla* in defence of Mutanabbī. His immediate motive is that he finds his opponents disagreeing with him on the merits of the poet because his poetry is alien

88. Some of my findings correspond with those of I. 'Abbās, *Ta'rīkh an-Naqd al-Adabī 'ind al-'Arab: Naqd ash-Shi'r* (Beirut 1391/1971), pp. 245–250. 'Abbās demonstrates that some of the maxims are attributed to other Greek philosophers and that it would be possible to find further examples of Greek *sententiae* that are reflected in Mutanabbī's poetry.

89. Ed. M.Y. Najm, Beirut 1961.

90. Ed. M.Ḥ. Āl Yāsīn, Baghdad 1385/1965. As is to be expected, this treatise contains a considerable number of lines that are also found in the *Ḥātimīyya* (it has 53 lines in common with the *Ḥātimīyya* in the ed. by Bustānī), though there is no other indication that the two works are in any way related.

Ibn Ṭabāṭabā al-'Alawī (d. 322/934) believes that Aristotle inspired the poets Ṣāliḥ b. 'Abdalquddūs and Abu 'l-'Atāhiya, see his *Iyār ash-Shi'r*, ed. Ṭ. al-Ḥājirī and M.Z. Salām (Cairo 1956), p. 80. See also Ḥātimī, *Ḥilyat al-Muḥāḍara*, MS Fez 2934, fol. 98a–b: the same parallel for Ṣāliḥ and a different parallel for Abu 'l-'Atāhiya.

The MS Berlin, Wetzstein 1229 (above, p. 23, note 68) has on fols. 96a–101a a *Faṣl fī nubadh min kalām ba'ḍ al-ḥukamā' wa-'l-Mutanabbī wa-fī faḍl al-'adl wa-zīnatiḥ wa-qubḥ az-zulm wa-shīnatiḥ min kalām Jālīnūs al-ḥakīm wa-'l-Mutanabbī*.

Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1350) maintains that even the poet Jarīr drew his inspiration from Aristotle, see his *Rawḍat al-Muḥibbīn*, ed. A. 'Ubayd (Cairo 1375/1956), p. 138. A similar claim with regard to Akḥṭal and "a Greek sage" (*ba'ḍ al-Yūnāniyyīn*) in *Ḥilya*, fol. 98a, lines 5–6.

Recent attempts to compare the poetry of Mutanabbī to the Iliad of Homer (see G. Ghurayyib, *al-Mutanabbī* [Beirut 1967], pp. 478–484) show that the genre still persists!

to them⁹¹; (b) a short exposition (which may not have come down intact) on the human intellect as it manifests itself in the composition of prose and poetry; (c) a statement to the effect that Mutanabbī versified “philosophical themes and subjects derived from logic” (*atā fī shi‘rihi bi-aghārādin falsafiyyatin wa-ma‘ānin manṭiqiyyatin*) which means that he was either an accomplished student of philosophy, or an independent poet-philosopher who formulated, by coincidence, the same themes and subjects as Aristotle, and by doing so in a concise and eloquent manner demonstrated the superiority of his style over that of the philosophers; in either case his achievement would have been most outstanding. To prove his point, the author will put side by side sayings by Aristotle and lines of poetry from the oeuvre of Mutanabbī⁹².

B. A second long version represented by 4 and, perhaps, 12 which consists of (a) (if my interpretation of the partially corrupt text is correct) a statement to the effect that Mutanabbī is underestimated by some people because they cannot understand him⁹³. Then follow (b) and (c) in essentially the same form as in the preceding version.

91. والذي بعثني . . . منافرة خصومي فيه لما رأيت من نفور عقولهم عنه وتصغيرهم لقدره (صغر أقدارهم (variant:)).

I am not certain however how this passage (especially the term نفور عقولهم) is to be understood.

92. Assuming that this introduction, as well as the *risāla* itself, are authentic, I would find it difficult to agree with those critics (e.g. Blachère, p. 269) who believe that Ḥātimī’s praise of Mutanabbī was a mere pretence intended to cover up an attempt to show that Mutanabbī’s work was un-Islamic, or to emphasize yet another aspect of Mutanabbī’s plagiarism.

93. The Vatican MS (4) has, after the *basmala*:

أبيات المتنبي المقابلة بحكم أرسطاطاليس قال الشيخ أبو علي الحاتمي تولا الله مكافاته لما رأيت ما استبشعه الناس من عظم قدر / أبي الطيب أحمد بن الحسين في علو همته وقدر رياسته وسمو نفسه التي شرفت / وعظم فراسته في صناعة الشعر علمت أن ذلك من نفور عقولهم عنه وصغر (؟) أقدارهم / وقد ثبت عند ذوى العقول . . .

The Bologna MS (11) begins as follows:

الرسالة الحاتمية (بسملة) قال بعض الأدباء ان الألفاظ / التي أخذها أبو الطيب أحمد بن الحسين المتنبي منافرة بصق في فيه (sic) لما رأيت من منافرة عقولهم / وصغر أقدارهم وقد ثبت عند ذوى العقول . . .

The text in the Bologna manuscript may of course be a mutilated version of the text mentioned under A.

C. A version represented by 3 and 11 which joins the first *risāla* (i.e. the debate) to the “Second *Risāla Ḥātimīyya*”. It consists of (a) a paragraph in which Ḥātimī explains (if my reading of the text is correct) that he feared to become the target of Mutanabbī’s wrath, made up his quarrel with the poet, and recognized his merits⁹⁴. This prompted him to write down those verses which corresponded to what the philosophers (plural!) had said (*al-abyāt min shi’rih al-muqābala limā qālat al-ḥukamā’*) and which also happened to be his most precious achievements (*al-jāmi’a li-jawāhir shi’rih*), so that [henceforth?] harmonious relations existed between the two (*wa-ḥasuna ’l-ḥālu baynī wa-baynahu*); and (b) a statement about Mutanabbī’s versification of philosophical themes. This part of the introduction is the same as that under (c) in the two preceding versions, but does not link up as clearly with the beginning of the introduction as it does in the two preceding versions⁹⁵.

D. A version represented by 7, 18, and 19 which, after the author has been mentioned, goes straight to the statement on Mutanabbī’s versification of philosophical themes. The wording of the three introductions in this version does not show important differences⁹⁶. The manuscripts mentioned under 2, 5, 6, 20, 24, the MS Saray, Medine 548, and the abstracts have no introduction (the Medine MS is probably incomplete). The manuscript under 6 is the text used in the facsimile edition with translation published by Rescher. Rescher does not even mention the existence of an introduction, though he must at least have known that it existed in the *Tuḥfa* edition. The careful edition by Bustānī, which includes an introduction by the editor, a critical apparatus, and notes, is therefore the only standard edition of the “Second *Risāla Ḥātimīyya*”, even though the authenticity of the introduction, the correct number of parallels, and even the authenticity of the work as a whole remains to be established.

Next a few words must be said about two versions of the report on the debate between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī which have been mentioned earlier, but have not been discussed in detail. One of the two (the first

94. See below, p. 33.

95. وحسن الحال بيني وبينه والأبيات هذه قال أبو علي الحاتمي
وجدنا أبا الطيب أحمد بن الحسين المتنبّي قد أتى في شعره
بأغراض فلسفية من ألفاظ أرسطاطاليس ومعان منطقية .

Note that there is no longer question of other *ḥukamā’* as in the preceding paragraph, but only of Aristotle; but cf. also the somewhat repetitious phrase towards the end of the paragraph: وأنا أورد من شعره ومن كلام الحكماء ما يستدل به على فضله في نفسه وفضل علمه وأدبه واغراقه في طلب الحكمة

See below, pp. 32–33 for the complete text.

96. The text of no. 7 appears on p. 275 of the Bustānī ed.

part of the text under C) is preserved in the MS Ambrosiana N.F. F 300 and the MS Mecca, Ḥaram, Adab 255/5 edited by Ḥ. M.

ash-Shammā⁹⁷ under the title *Munāzara bayn Abi 'l-Tayyib al-Mutanabbī wa-'l-Ḥatīmī*; the second is preserved in Khafājī's *Rayḥāna*, in a manuscript in the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, and in a manuscript of the *Tadhkira Ṣalāhiyya* in the India Office Library in London.

Almost all of the second half of the Ambrosiana manuscript is missing, so that it only covers the beginning of the “first *risāla*” and the beginning of the “second *risāla*”, but the *Munāzara* is complete. Though the *Munāzara* occasionally offers a better text than the Ambrosiana manuscript, it shares with this manuscript some manifest errors suggesting that the two versions are closely related. The importance of this published version is further reduced by numerous inaccuracies on the part of the editor (these are clearly evident when one compares his text with the three pages he reproduces in facsimile!) which makes it hard to rely on his text as a true copy of the Mecca manuscript. Some of the most interesting passages in the two texts are corrupt, and even where the text is understandable there may be a few lacunae. In some cases I have tacitly corrected evident mistakes; in other cases I have simply reproduced both versions. Where I offer only one text the two versions do not show important differences. I hope to prepare at some future time a list of corrections to Shammā's edition which takes into account parallel passages in the three other accounts of the debate.

I quote here the introduction of the work as it appears in the Ambrosiana manuscript with some variants from the edition by Shammā':

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم [وبه نستعين]⁹⁸ هذا شرح مناظرة جرت
بين أبي علي محمد بن الحسين (!) الحاتمي و[بين]⁹⁸ أبي الطيب
المتنبي وهو كتاب مضاهاة شعر المتنبي بقول⁹⁹ أرسطاطاليس
الحكيم قال جامع الكتاب أبو¹⁰⁰ عبد الله الحسين بن محمود بن
الحسين الكاتب البغدادي | الكاتب ببغداد في سنة تسع وستين
وثلاثمائة وقد جرى ذكر أبي الطيب المتنبي فقال أبو علي
محمد بن الحسين الحاتمي لقد كان لي معه نوبة عظيمة واني لممن

97. I failed to make a note of the place and date of publication.

98. Not in the Mecca MS.

99. The ed. by Shammā' has: وهو كتاب يضم شعر المتنبي بقول , but from the facsimile page it appears that the Mecca MS probably has the same reading as the Ambrosiana MS.

100. The Ambrosiana MS has: ابن .

يشهد له بالفضل والسودد وجودة الفهامة¹⁰¹ وصلاح القريحة ولم

يكن في وقته من يساويه في فنونه التي جمع فيها من الأدب
فنونا¹⁰² وذلك أنه ضرب في كل شيء منها بسهم وافر¹⁰³ وقال بعضهم
ما ساجلت ذا فن الا غلبني ولا ساجلني ذو فنون الا غلبته قال
الحاتمي دخل أبو الطيب بغداد في سنة خمس وخمسين وثلثمائة
وقد التحف برداء الكبير¹⁰⁴ ...

There are some interesting details in this account of Ḥātimī's meeting with Mutanabbī which are not in the version edited by Bisāṭī (and the text of the same version in Badī'ī's *Ṣubḥ* and in Yāqūt) or in the *Mūḍiḥa*: Following his arrival in Baghdad Mutanabbī pays several visits to Mu'izz ad-Dawla (what happens during these visits is not mentioned); on his way to Mu'izz ad-Dawla's palace he only returns the greetings of those who greet him first¹⁰⁵; Ḥātimī, at the request of Muhallabī, takes upon himself to vindicate Mu'izz ad-Dawla¹⁰⁶; the students attending Mutanabbī's classes study, in addition to Mutanabbī's poetry, the works of Mubarrad which Mutanabbī knows by heart¹⁰⁷; the riding animal which Ḥātimī uses on his way to meet Mutanabbī had been provided by Muhallabī¹⁰⁸; during the discussion a member of the audience dares to

101. The ed. by Shammā' has: بالفضل والدراية وجودة الغاية .

102. So in both manuscripts. Read: وقد جمع من الأدب فنونا لم يكن في .
(?) وقته من يساويه فيها .

103. The ed. by Shammā' reads , سهمها وافرا , but from the facsimile page it appears that the Mecca MS probably has the same reading as the Ambrosiana MS.

104. The ed. by Shammā' has: الكبرياء .

105. Ambrosiana MS, fol. 1b, lines 27-28; Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā', p. 250, lines 13-14 (read يبدأه for يبراه).

106. Ambrosiana MS, fol. 1b, lines 28-30; Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā', p. 250, line 14-p. 251, line 2.

107. Ambrosiana MS, fol. 2a lines 1-3: وكان قصاده هؤلاء يقرؤون عليه شعري

وكتب أبي العباس محمد بن يزيد المبرد وكان له ذلك حفظا .

Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā', p. 251, lines 4-6: وكان قصاده هؤلاء

يقرؤون عليه شعره وكتب أبي العباس محمد بن يزيد المبرد

وكان ذلك حفظا .

108. Ambrosiana MS, fol. 2a, lines 3-5; Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā', p. 251, lines 6-8.

contradict Mutanabbī and Mutanabbī orders his son Muḥassad¹⁰⁹ to oust the man from the room, but Ḥātimī prevails upon Mutanabbī to let him stay¹¹⁰; Ḥātimī was a *kātib* in the service of a Turkish dignitary at the time the meeting took place¹¹¹; Ḥātimī admits that he is afraid of what Mutanabbī might do to him and this is one of the reasons why he makes up his quarrel¹¹². What this version has in common with the Bisāṭī version and the third short version which will be discussed later is that all short versions give about equal attention to Mutanabbī's shortcomings as a poet, his plagiarisms, and his claim of not being acquainted with the poetry of Abū Tammām (whom he nevertheless plagiarizes).

Mutanabbī's ignorance of the history of certain themes and his poor knowledge of lexicography are also emphasized.

The first *risāla* in the Ambrosiana manuscript covers six folios (fols. 1b–6b), and the Mecca manuscript five (twenty printed pages). The two texts end with a paragraph that concludes the account of the meeting and also serves as an introduction to the “Second *Risāla Ḥātimīyya*”:

MS Ambrosiana N.F. F 300, fol 6a, last line (= p. 268, line 12 of the edition of the Mecca MS by Shammā‘):

ونَهَضْتُ وَنَهَضَ مُتَبَعًا لِي إِلَى بَابِ الدَّارِ وَنَهَضَ لِنَهْوِهِ مَنْ كَانَ بَيْنَ
يَدَيْهِ وَأَقْسَمْتُ عَلَيْهِ أَنْ لَا رَكْبَتَ حَتَّى يَعَاوِدَ وَمَضَيْتُ إِلَى مَنْزِلِي
وَتَشَاغَلْتُ بِقِيَّةِ يَوْمِي بِشُغْلٍ عَنْ لِي وَلَمْ أَحْضَرْ مَجْلِسَ الْمَهْلِيِّ وَانْتَهَى
الْخَبَرُ إِلَيْهِ فَحَضَرَهُ (؟) ¹¹³ وَأَتَتْنِي رَسَلُهُ لَيْلًا فَانْتَهَيْتُ إِلَيْهِ
وَقَصَصْتُ عَلَيْهِ الْحَالَ وَكَانَ مِنْ سُرُورِهِ وَابْتِهَاجِهِ بِمَا جَرَى مَا بَعَثَهُ
عَلَى الْمُبَادَرَةِ إِلَى مَعْرِزِ الدَّوْلَةِ وَابْخَارِهِ بِجُمْلَةِ الْحَالَ وَكَنتُ إِذْ
ذَاكَ أَكْتُبُ لِأَحَدٍ وَجْهَ الْأَتْرَاكِ (؟) ¹¹⁴ فَأَخْبَرَنِي الرَّئِيسُ أَبُو الْفَرَجِ
مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الْعَبَّاسِ أَنَّهُ سَاعَةً دَخَلَ عَلَى ¹¹⁵ مَعْرِزِ الدَّوْلَةِ قَالَ لَهُ عَلِمْتُ ¹¹⁶

109. I follow the vocalisation of this name adopted by Blachère (see index) which I have not succeeded in verifying.

110. Ambrosiana MS, fol. 4a, line 31-fol. 4b, line 7; Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā‘, p. 260, line 8.

111. Cf. above, p. 13.

112. See the final paragraph quoted below.

113. Illegible in the Mecca MS.

114. The Ambrosiana MS has: ... وَكَنتُ إِذْ ذَاكَ لِأَحَدٍ وَجْهَ (the last word is not clear). The Mecca MS has: ... وَكَنتُ آنْذَاكَ أَكْتُبُ لِأَحَدٍ وَجْهَ (the last word is illegible).

115. The Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā‘ has: دَخُولُهُ إِلَى .

116. The Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā‘ has: أَعْلَمْتُ .

ما كان بين الحاتمي والمتنبي قال نعم انه قد شفى لي منه صدرا¹¹⁷
وكان يصيب عنايته¹¹⁸ في أيام¹¹⁹ تصرفي¹²⁰ ثم عمرت ما بيني وبين
المتنبي وخفته¹²¹ بالحقيقة¹²² أن يشتغل بي دون كل أحد فيمزقني
كل ممزق واستبان لي فضله وبراعته فحداني ذلك على كتب الأبيات
من شعره المقابلة لما قالت¹²³ الحكماء وهي الجامعة لجواهر
شعره¹²⁴ وحسن الحال بيني وبينه والأبيات هذه قال أبو علي
الحاتمي وجدنا أبا الطيب أحمد بن الحسين المتنبي قد أتى في شعره
بأغراض فلسفية من ألفاظ أرسطاطاليس¹²⁵ ومعان منطقية فان كان¹²⁶
ذلك منه عن فحص ونظر وبحث فقد أغرق في [درس]¹²⁷ كتب الفلاسفة
وان يكن منه¹²⁸ على سبيل الاتفاق فقد زاد على الفلاسفة بالايجاز
والبلاغة والألفاظ لغريبة¹²⁹ وأنا أورد من شعره ومن كلام الحكماء¹³⁰
ما¹³¹ يستدل به على فضله في نفسه وفضل علمه وأدبه واغراقه
في طلب الحكمة فمن ذلك ما قال أرسطاطاليس الحكيم اذا كانت
الشهوة...

It is tempting to accept the testimony by a contemporary of Ḥātimī as evidence that the “Second *Risāla Ḥātimīyya*” is authentic. I do not feel that this is possible, since there is no external evidence to confirm this version of the debate, or any particular reason why we should consider it

117. The Ambrosiana MS has: قد شفا لي منه مبدرا. The Mecca MS has: قد شفا لي .

118. Illegible in the Mecca MS.

119. Unpointed in the Ambrosiana MS.

120. The meaning of this last sentence is not clear and there may be a lacuna. I am not certain whether Ḥātimī or Mu‘izz ad-Dawla is the subject and hesitate to propose an emendation, though several could be suggested, e.g.: وكان يصيب في عنايته . وكان لي نصيب من عنايته في أيام تصرفي , or: بي فأقام نصرتي .

121. The Ambrosiana MS probably has: وحفته .

122. One could suggest reading: وحفته بالمحقيقة وخفته .

123. The Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā‘ has: والمقابلة لما قالته .

124. The Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā‘ has: الجامعة الجواهره بشعره (sic) .

125. The Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā‘ has: في ألفاظ لأرسطاطاليس .

126. The Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā‘ has: يكن .

127. Not in the Mecca MS according to the ed. by Shammā‘ .

128. The Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā‘ adds: ذلك .

129. Unpointed in the Ambrosiana MS; the Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā‘ has:

الغريبة .

130. The Ambrosiana MS has: الحكمى .

131. The Ambrosiana MS has: اما .

more reliable than the other versions. The date it gives for Mutanabbī's arrival in Baghdad, 355, is wrong (Mutanabbī died in 354), and it is not easy to attribute this date to a copyist error. The paragraph beginning with *Fa-ḥadānī dhālīka* and ending with *wa-ḥasuna 'l-ḥālu baynī wa-baynahu* suggests that the "Second *Risāla*" was composed while Mutanabbī was still in Baghdad; yet it contains a line that belongs to Mutanabbī's last poem which he wrote shortly before his death¹³². On the other hand there can be little doubt that whatever role Ḥusayn b. Maḥmūd may have played as an editor of the two *risālas*, the account of the debate is essentially Ḥātimī's, since the involved, sometimes obscure, but always lively style is the same we know from the *Mūḍiḥa*. It is also interesting to note that the "Second *Risāla*" (in the Mecca manuscript, since most of the second part of the Ambrosiana manuscript is missing) has 93 parallels, a number that, as we have seen, is also found in another old version, that by Usāma. Moreover, the Ḥusayn b. Maḥmūd version of the "First *Risāla*" anticipates one of the maxims which appears later in the "Second *Risāla*" in the form of a parallel¹³³. Perhaps we would be on firmer ground if Ḥusayn b. Maḥmūd could be identified, but the collections of biographies at my disposal do not give his name¹³⁴. Nor did I find him in any of the collections of poetry and prose where one might expect literary critics interested in poetry of the fourth/tenth century to be quoted. It is to be hoped that one of the manuscripts listed by Sezgin which I did not see will turn out to be a text of the Ḥusayn b. Maḥmūd version.

Equally interesting, but more on account of its omissions, is a text preserved in Shihābaddīn al-Khafājī's (d. 1069/1658) *Rayḥānat al-Alibbā'*¹³⁵, in the MS Peterm. II 228 of the Staatsbibliothek in

132. Page 293 of the ed. by Shammā' corresponding to p. 927, no. 87 in Bustānī's ed.

133. Ambrosiana MS, fol. 2b, lines 10–13; Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā', p. 253, lines 2–4: ومن زاد في الشيء ما ليس فيه نقص الشيء عن قيمته وقد جاء ذلك اللفظ موجزا فقالوا الزيادة في الحد نقصان في المحدود وقد خرجت بالشيء عن حده الذي هو جملة الأدب الى سوء الأدب (خرجت بالشعر (the ed. by Shammā' has قال Cf. p. 289, line 15 of the ed. by Shammā' (= Bustānī's ed., p. 761, no. 58): الحكيم الزيادة في الحد نقصان في المحدود.

Cf. also the parallel between Mutanabbī, Nājim, and Aristotle (above, p. 20, note 58) which is in all three versions.

134. Cf. however *Ta'ṛ. Bagh.*, VIII, 101–102; Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam* (above, p. 14, note 35), VII, 192 where a certain Abū 'Abdallāh al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Kātib who lived "in the city of al-Manṣūr" is mentioned among those who died in the year 387. His biography does not give us any clues that would justify his identification with our Ḥusayn b. Maḥmūd.

135. Ed. 'A.M. al-Ḥulw (Cairo 1386/1967), II, 421–427.

Berlin¹³⁶, and in a manuscript of the *Tadhkira Ṣalāḥiyya* of Ṣalāḥaddīn Khalīl b. Aybak aṣ-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363) in the India Office Library¹³⁷, which is yet another version of the debate between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī. It states that Mutanabbī, when he came to Baghdad, behaved in an arrogant manner, that Ḥātimī visited him and challenged him in the presence of his students though at the end of the meeting the challenger and his unsuccessful opponent parted as good friends, that Ḥātimī recognized the merits of Mutanabbī's poetry, and that this prompted him to write his *Risāla Ḥātimīyya*. As in the other versions, it is Ḥātimī himself who tells the story, but strangely enough there is no mention here of either Mu'izz ad-Dawla or Muhallabī inciting Ḥātimī to try to humiliate Mutanabbī, nor of Ibn Fasānjus¹³⁸ reporting news of the debate to Muhallabī. Except for the final sentence, Ḥātimī gives no indication that he had any appreciation for Mutanabbī's gifts as a poet. The number of examples quoted from Mutanabbī's work is limited to six. The *risāla* is therefore much shorter than the "shorter version" in Bisāṭī's edition (which is also reported by Yāqūt and Badī'ī) and the version in the Ambrosiana and Mecca manuscripts, so that we now have actually three shorter versions. This does not mean, however, that Khafājī's text is simply a digest of the shorter version in Bisāṭī's edition as the editor of the *Rayḥāna* (p. 421, note 2) suggests. Nor is it a digest of the *Mūḍiḥa*. It should rather be considered as a fourth version which draws phrases from the short versions and the *Mūḍiḥa*, though it is undoubtedly closer to the former. This makes it likely that what we have here is one more account of the meeting between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī. But how to explain the absence of any reference to the rivalries which led to this meeting and the personalities involved? Were they simply omitted because whoever composed this version was not interested in these details? It is possible. But this does not explain why the *risāla* does not in other respects agree with one of the other versions; for this is precisely what one would expect if the author of this version had left out what he considered irrelevant. One can therefore make a good case for accepting this version as the work of Ḥātimī himself. Assuming that the shortest version of a work is likely to be the oldest, one could further suggest that Mu'izz ad-Dawla and Muhallabī had nothing to do with the disputation between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī and were only introduced later by Ḥātimī to enhance his own prestige. However, even if we consider the account quoted in the *Yatīma* of

136. See Ahlwardt's catalogue (above, p. 23, note 67), no. 3746. The text is part of a *majmū'a* (fols. 41b–46a). Ahlwardt gives no indication of its date.

137. London, India Office Library, Ar. MS 3829, fols. 210a–211b (not 204–212 as stated in the *Majallat al-Majma' al-'Ilmī al-'Arabī bi-Dimashq*, vol. IX [1929], p. 688). According to the handwritten catalogue, the manuscript dates from the fifteenth century.

138. See above, p. 32 and below, p. 37.

Mutanabbī's stay in Baghdad as sketchy and unreliable¹³⁹, it nevertheless supports Ḥātimī's claim that Muhallabī involved him in attempts to force Mutanabbī to leave Baghdad. It is somewhat difficult therefore to believe that the rivalry between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī was a "private affair". There may of course have been any number of reasons why the earliest version of the *risāla* omitted any mention of the involvement of Mu'izz ad-Dawla and Muhallabī: Ḥātimī's position at the courts of these two officials may not have been as secure as that of Ibn al-Ḥajjāj (d. 391/1001) and Ibn Sukkara al-Hāshimī (d. 385/995) who, according to the *Yatīma*, were also involved in attacks on Mutanabbī. Or Ḥātimī's role may not have been as important. If the earliest version was written shortly after the disputation, Ḥātimī would have been reluctant to emphasize his prominence at the expense of others. Assuming that the *risāla* was written immediately after the death of Muhallabī, there could also have been political motives prompting Ḥātimī to omit the name of his former patron as well as any suggestion that Mu'izz ad-Dawla and Muhallabī had been on friendly terms. Miskawayh (*Tajārib*, II, 197–198) reports that Muhallabī fell into disrepute after his death during a campaign in Oman; his belongings were confiscated and his family and children put under arrest.

The problem of the number of authentic writings by Ḥātimī on Mutanabbī is further complicated by the final sentence of the *Mūdiḥa* in which the author promises a comprehensive *risāla* on Mutanabbī's shortcomings and merits¹⁴⁰. That such a *risāla* may indeed have existed appears from Ṣafadī's *Nuṣrat ath-Thā'ir 'alā 'l-Mathal as-Sā'ir*¹⁴¹, though the passage is not very clear.

Some further observations should be made on the *Mūdiḥa*, the title and introduction of which have been discussed earlier. Though the text of the *Mūdiḥa* is well-preserved and has been published in a reliable edition, I feel that it allows no positive conclusions about the circumstances under which the meeting between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī took place, and in

139. See *Yatīma*¹, I, 85–86, ², I, 136–137, and above, p. 9.

140. Page 196:
وأنا أشفع هذه الرسالة بما تتبعته من عواره . . .
وأذكر أيضا من محاسن شعره ومن عيون مدائحه . . . ما أجرى
في جميعه مع الحق وأفرد بذلك كتابا وأستقصيه .

141. Ed. M. 'A. Sulṭānī (Damascus 1391/1971), p. 181:
وممن عابه وحط عليه
الصاحب ابن عباد . . . ومنهم الحاتمي في رسالة لطيفة
ورسالة أخرى أملاها الحاتمي في معاييه وهي مجلدة لطيفة .

It is curious that in the *Wāfi* (above, p. 14, note 35 and p. 15) Ṣafadī refers only to a book on the debate and to the collection of parallels.

this respect contributes nothing to the other versions. Nor does it permit any conclusions about the history of these other versions. The *Mūdiḥa* is dedicated to Abu 'l-Faraj Muḥammad b. al-'Abbās b. Mūsā ash-Shirāzī, also known as Ibn Fasānjus (or Fasānjas). Ibn Fasānjus appears in the shorter version in Bisāṭī's edition¹⁴², in Badī'ī's *Ṣubḥ*¹⁴³ (but not in the Yāqūt text which is otherwise identical with Bisāṭī and Badī'ī) and in the Ambrosiana and Mecca manuscripts¹⁴⁴ as a friend of Ḥātimī who brought him the good news of the favourable impression which Ḥātimī's successful attempt to humiliate Mutanabbī had made on Mu'izz ad-Dawla¹⁴⁵. In the preface of the *Mūdiḥa* (p. 1, line 11 ff.) he is introduced as the patron who encourages Ḥātimī to commit his memories of the event to writing. Ḥātimī hesitates because he feels that his age and his standing as a man of letters put him above what as a young man he was most eager to do (this may be an allusion to the existence of an earlier version)¹⁴⁶, and because he fears that many may not be prepared to trust his account. This in spite of the presence of many reputable witnesses, as well as a spy from Muhallabī, who can testify to the success of his mission and the precocity of his talent at the time of the meeting. Yet he feels that Abu 'l-Faraj's testimony carries enough weight to help him overcome these hesitations. He sets to work and reconstructs the discussion that took place assisted by persons (from Abu 'l-Faraj's entourage?) who were present at the time. He informs us that he has added reports of meetings that followed shortly after the first encounter, and admits having reworded much of what was said, so as to widen the scope of the work¹⁴⁷. But he seems to imply that these additions do not affect the substance of the account so as to make it unreliable, and do not result in any injustice being done to Mutanabbī. We find here, in the *Mūdiḥa*, the same ambivalence in Ḥātimī's picture of Mutanabbī which we find in the shorter versions: He portrays him at one and the same time as an excellent poet and as a man of despicable arrogance who

142. Page 269, line 14.

143. Page 142, line 10. Both texts read *Abu 'l-Qāsim* for *Abu 'l-Faraj* in the Ambrosiana MS, the Mecca MS, and the *Mūdiḥa*.

144. See above, p. 32.

145. On Abu 'l-Faraj and Mu'izz ad-Dawla see Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, II, 197–198, Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fi 'l-Ta'rikh*, ed. C.J. Tornberg (Leiden 1851–1876), VIII, 405–406, Zambaur, p. 214; Busse, pp. 188, 236, and 238 (see also index). Abu 'l-Faraj shared his power with Abu 'l-Faql al-'Abbās b. al-Ḥusayn ash-Shirāzī after the death of Muhallabī, without either of the two receiving the title of vizier from Mu'izz ad-Dawla.

146. Ḥātimī's verbose account is sometimes difficult to follow, especially in the preface and the introduction. Cf. his observations on his own style on p. 3, lines 14–17 and p. 4, lines 14–15.

147. Cf. pp. 101–102: Mutanabbī makes a change in one of his poems after the debate, as reported to Ḥātimī at a later date; pp. 108–109: Ḥātimī interrupts his account of the debate for an excursus on another line by Mutanabbī. See also below, p. 46.

deserved to be chased away from the Buwayhid seat of government though, in this preface at least, he takes a more detached attitude and sees himself as an instrument of Muhallabī's policies (p. 2, line 20-p. 3, line 3).

The dedication to Ibn Fasānjus raises an interesting problem. According to Miskawayh, Ibn Fasānjus' short vizierate ended in 360 with his arrest, and ultimately with his banishment to Samarra¹⁴⁸. It is unlikely that Ḥātimī composed the *Mūdiha* for him during his period of office¹⁴⁹, since otherwise he would not refer to the meeting with Mutanabbī in 351 or 352 as an event that took place in his youth (p. 2, line 4: *fi ḥālī 'l-ghirārati wa-līni 'l-ghuṣni*)¹⁵⁰. The clue may perhaps be found in Yāqūt (VI, 259, lines 5–7) where an account is given of the celebration of 'Aḍud ad-Dawla's birthday. From this description it appears that Abu 'l-Faraj and his brother Abū Muḥammad 'Alī b. al-'Abbās enjoyed a position of respect because of the rank they had occupied in earlier days (*li-ri'āsatihim al-qadīma*) and were most likely living again in Baghdad. Since Abu 'l-Faraj died in 370¹⁵¹, it seems likely that the *Mūdiha* was written somewhere between 365 and 370, at which time Ḥātimī could with some justification claim that his disputation with Mutanabbī took place during the early days of his career.

One expects that Ḥātimī, in order to have his detailed account in the *Mūdiha* accepted as authentic and correct in its main outline, will avoid committing any striking anachronisms. I have in fact found none, though I have not been able to confirm from other sources that two of the personalites who reportedly attended the later meetings, Abu 'l-Ḥasan ['Alī b. Ka'b] al-Anṣārī and Abu 'l-Faṭḥ [Muḥammad b. Ja'far] al-Marāghī, belonged to the entourage of Muhallabī¹⁵². Neither have I

148. Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, II, 260, 283, and 287; See also Tanūkhī, *Nishwār*, II, 219–220. The vizierate lasted apparently over a period of four hundred days in 359–360, not "a few days in 358" as in Zambaur, p. 214 and Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil* (above, p. 37, note 145), VIII, 443. Busse, p. 328, basing himself on Hamadhānī's *Takmilat Ta'rīkh at-Tabarī* which is not accessible to me, mentions that Ibn Fasānjus was banished to Samarra in Rajab 366/February-March 977. See also *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed. (Leiden-London 1960), s.v. Banū Fasāndjus and M. Kabir, *The Buwayhid Dynasty of Baghdad* (Calcutta 1964), pp. 18–20.

149. In spite of the *adāma 'llāhu qudratahu* on p. 2, line 8.

150. Further references to his being a young man at the time of the meeting on pp. 7–8.

151. Šafadī, *Das Biographische Lexicon (al-Wāfi bi-'l-Wafayāt)*, ed. H. Ritter and S. Dederling (Leipzig-Istanbul 1931 = *Bibliotheca Islamica*, Band VI), III, 198; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil* (above, p. 37, note 145), IX, 7.

152. For the Mu'tazilite theologian, Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Anṣārī, see Tawḥīdī, *Mathālib (Akhlaq) al-Wazīrayn*¹, pp. 138 and 270, ², pp. 203 and 410, where he is presented as a member of the entourage of 'Izz ad-Dawla and Abu 'l-Faṭḥ b. al-'Amīd. The *Mathālib* mentions that he was alive in 360. See also Tawḥīdī, *Imtā'*, I, 93, 108, II, 135 (interesting discussion on the merits of poetry and prose), III, 154, 156, 196 (read *Ibn Ka'b for Abū Ka'b* ?); idem, *Muqābasāt*, ed. Ḥ. Sandūbī (Cairo 1347/1929), p. 69; idem, *aṣ-Ṣadāqa wa-ṣ-Ṣadiq* (index); Yāqūt, V, 237, lines 11–12. From the

succeeded in establishing the year in which Muhallabī's son-in-law, Abū 'Alī al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Anbārī died, so that some uncertainty prevails about his being alive at the time of the discussion¹⁵³.

The debate between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī as it is described in the shorter versions consists, as we have seen, of one single session, but in the *Mūdiḥa* Ḥātimī describes three further meetings which, he says, all took place in the house of Muhallabī. Again there is no internal or external evidence that clearly contradicts Ḥātimī's claim. According to Badī'ī¹⁵⁴, Mutanabbī reached Kūfa, after his flight from Egypt, in Rabī' II (variants: Jumādā and Jumādā II) of the year 351, and continued from there to Baghdad at an unspecified date. According to Blachère (p. 218) the date of Mutanabbī's arrival in Kūfa was Rabī' I 351/April 962. Blachère bases this information on a note in Wāḥidī's commentary (p. 699). His stay in Kūfa lasted at least till Shawwāl 351/November 962, again according to Blachère (p. 220) who follows Wāḥidī (p. 613: Shawwāl 351) and 'Ukbarī (III, 148: year 351). The poem in the introduction of which we find this last date was written in reply to a gift from Sayf ad-Dawla. Wāḥidī however does not specify that the present was sent to Kūfa or that the reply came from that city, while 'Ukbarī mentions only that the reply was sent from Kūfa to Aleppo¹⁵⁵. If

Imtā' it appears that he took part in discussions in the presence of Ḥātimī's patron, Ibn Sa'dān (above, pp. 10–11).

For Abu 'l-Faṭḥ al-Marāghī see Ibn an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, ed. G. Flügel (Leipzig 1871–1872), p. 85; *Ta' r. Bagh.*, II, 152–153; Ibn al-Qifṭī, *Inbāh* (above, p. 14, note 35), III, 83 and 87; Yāqūt, VI, 466–467; Suyūṭī, *Bughya*, p. 28; Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam* (above, p. 14, note 35), VII, 134; C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, 2nd ed. (Leiden 1937/1949), S III, 1194 (notes to I, 159). Abu 'l-Faṭḥ al-Marāghī is quoted in the *Mathālib*, the *Muqābasāt*, and the *Imtā'* of Tawḥidī (see indexes). Marāghī was alive in 371.

153. For Muhallabī's son-in-law see below, pp. 47–49.

154. Badī'ī, *Ṣubḥ*, pp. 127–128.

155. Cf. also the edition of Mutanabbī's *Dīwān* by 'A. 'Azzām (Cairo 1363/1944), pp. 426–427 which was not available when Blachère wrote his biography of Mutanabbī. One of the manuscripts used by 'Azzām (the recension of Tāj ad-Dīn Abu 'l-Yumn al-Kindī) reports that Sayf ad-Dawla sent his own son from Aleppo to hand over the gift. A second manuscript (which claims to go back to a recension dictated by Mutanabbī himself) states that the poem was composed in Kūfa and reached Sayf ad-Dawla in Aleppo. The manuscript from the Ayasofya dated 483 which 'Azzām used as a basis for his edition gives Shawwāl 352 as the date of composition of the poem. If it is correct that Sayf ad-Dawla sent his own son, it is inconceivable that the present could have reached Mutanabbī in Baghdad and somewhat unlikely, though not impossible, that the poem with the reply would have been sent from Baghdad. Only 'Ukbarī's commentary (III, 148) states clearly that the poem was written in 351 and that it was sent from Kūfa to Aleppo. One cannot therefore rule out the possibility that Mutanabbī wrote the poem in Shawwāl 352, after his return from Baghdad which took place, according to Blachère (p. 229), in or before the beginning of Sha'bān 352/ end of August 963 (on this date there is apparently no disagreement). All this raises considerable uncertainty about the date of Mutanabbī's departure from Kūfa for Baghdad. Mutanabbī's pupil, Ibn Jinnī (quoted in the same

Ḥātīmī's report that he undertook his first visit at the instigation of Muḥallabī is correct, the first debate as well as the successive debates must have taken place before Muḥallabī left Baghdad in Jumādā II 352/June-July 963 (for an expedition to Oman from which he never returned). Ḥātīmī offers an amusing picture of Mutanabbī carrying seven tunics (*aqbiya*) of different colours one over the other, in spite of the heat which (he says in the *Mūdiḥa*) almost made the brain melt¹⁵⁶. May or

place in 'Azzām's ed.), believes that the poem was written as late as 353, and even this last date cannot be ruled out with certainty. Blachère (p. 220, note 1) argues that 'Alī b. Ḥamza studied the poem under Mutanabbī in Baghdad (see 'Ukbarī, III, 159, line 5) and that for that reason the poem must have been composed before Mutanabbī's arrival. But there is no good reason to believe that Mutanabbī, on his way to Persia, could not again have stayed in Baghdad (see 'Azzām's ed., p. 537 quoting Ibn Jinnī and Blachère, p. 219–220, note 4 quoting the *Ziyādāt Dīwān Shi'r al-Mutanabbī* by 'Abdal'azīz al-Maymanī ar-Rājkūtī, Cairo 1345, p. 22), or that 'Alī b. Ḥamza could not have followed him to Kūfa (he followed him to Arrajān, see 'Abdalqādir al-Baghdādī, *Khizāna*, II, 356). The chronology of events cannot be examined in detail until all the available recensions of the *Dīwān* have been published (Blachère suggests, as a solution to the various discrepancies, that some fragments may have been composed three or four years before they were incorporated in poems sent to Sayf ad-Dawla). Cf. also the uncertainty about the time and place of composition of Mutanabbī's *qaṣīda* on the elder sister of Sayf ad-Dawla apparent from the various introductions quoted in 'Azzām's ed., p. 422 (cf. also *Ṣubḥ*, p. 147, lines 5–7) and his *qaṣīda* in reply to a letter from Sayf ad-Dawla on p. 431 (*Ṣubḥ*, p. 109), the second of which may again have been written during a second stay in Baghdad prior to Mutanabbī's departure for Persia (see also Blachère, p. 232, note 1). The study by F. Gabrieli on the life of Mutanabbī quoted by Blachère is unfortunately not accessible to me.

The anonymous recension of the *Dīwān* in the Bibliothèque Générale in Rabat (D 81, p. 279) introduces Mutanabbī's reply to Sayf ad-Dawla's present as follows:

وأنفذ اليه سيف الدولة ابنه من حلب الى الكوفة . . .
اثنين وخمسين وثلاثمائة : ما لنا . . .

156. *Mūdiḥa*, p. 9, line 16 – p. 10, line 1: وإذا به لابس سبعة أقبية كل قباء
منها لون وكنا في وغرة القيظ وجمرة الصيف وفي يوم تكاد
ودائع الهامات تسيل فيه . . .

(variant in notes: فألفيته لابسا سبعة أقبية بعضها محشو)

Shorter version in Bisāṭī's ed., p. 254, lines 13–15: وإذا هو قد لابس سبعة

أقبية كل قباء منها لون وكان الوقت آخر أيام الصيف
وأخلقها بتخفيف اللبس .

Yāqūt, VI, 506, lines 5–7 reads آخر for آخر, but otherwise gives the same text.

Badī'ī, *Ṣubḥ*, p. 129, lines 6–7: ولبس سبعة أقبية ملونة وكان الوقت
أحر ما يكون من الصيف وأحق بتخفيف اللبس .

MS Ambrosiana N.F. F 300, fol. 2a, lines 10–12: وإذا هو لابس سبعة أقبية
كل قباء منها فيها لون وكان الوقت آخر أوقات الصيف وأحقها
بتخفيف الثياب .

June is therefore the most likely date. Against this assumption one can raise two objections: In the shorter version in Bisāṭī's edition and in the Ambrosiana and Mecca manuscripts we read that the discussion at Mutanabbī's residence took place "in the last days of the summer" (*ākhir ayyām aṣ-ṣayf* or *ākhir awqāt aṣ-ṣayf*), and in the shorter version in Bisāṭī's edition (p. 256), in the *Ṣubḥ* of al-Badī'i (p. 131), and in Yāqūt (VI, 507–508) we find a line of poetry said to be part of a poem composed on the death of the sister of Sayf ad-Dawla which took place on 26 Jumādā II 352¹⁵⁷, that is after the departure of Muhallabī which took place on the 6th¹⁵⁸. It is, however, legitimate to suggest that *ākhir*, in this context, is a misreading for *aḥarr* which is in fact the reading of Yāqūt and the *Ṣubḥ*. The reference to the sister of Sayf ad-Dawla is most likely a copyist error, since in the *Mūdiḥa* (p. 21), as well as in the version in the *Rayḥāna* (p. 423), the Berlin manuscript (fol. 42b), and the India Office Library manuscript (fol. 210b), the poem is correctly identified as having been written on the occasion of the death of Sayf ad-Dawla's mother (the version in the Ambrosiana and Mecca manuscripts does not say for whom it was composed)¹⁵⁹. It is possible that whoever committed this mistake was thinking of a younger sister of Sayf ad-Dawla who died in Ramaḍān 344/December 955¹⁶⁰. Still the possibility cannot be ruled out, as has been rightly pointed out by M.S. Kiktev¹⁶¹, that Mutanabbī arrived in Baghdad as early as the spring of 351 since, as we have just seen, the date of the poem he is said to have sent to Sayf ad-Dawla from Kūfa is uncertain. There is no good reason to reject Ḥātimī's assertion in the *Mūdiḥa* that Mutanabbī fled immediately after the last humiliating

The Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā', p. 251, lines 13–14 reads فيها فيه .
Khaḥājī, *Rayḥāna*, p. 421, lines 8–9: فأقبل وعليه سبعة أقبية كل منها

بلون في أشد ما يكون من الحسن يحفها (sic) فضل اللباس .

MS Berlin, Peterm. II 228, fol. 41b: ثم أقبل وقد لبس سبعة أقبية كل

قباء لون في أشد ما يكون من الحسن وأحقها [42a](sic) بفضل اللباس.

في آخر ما يكون من أوقات الصيف وأحقها بتخفيف فضل
اللباس ?

The text in the India Office Library MS of the *Tadhkira Ṣalāḥiyya* is the same as in the MS Peterm. II 228. It is curious that the unintelligible reading of the last sentence was accepted by as knowledgeable an author as Ṣafadī was.

157. Blachère, p. 226. See also 'Azzām's ed. of the *Dīwān*, p. 422: 26 Jumādā II 352 or Sha'bān 352.

158. Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, II, 196.

159. See Wāḥidī, p. 392; 'Ukbarī, III, 17; and 'Azzām's ed., p. 256 for this line.

160. Blachère, p. 179. The inconsistency was pointed out by M.S. Kiktev in *Literatura Vostoka* 1969, p. 81, note. Kiktev also points out that the *marthiya* on the elder sister was more famous than the poem on Sayf ad-Dawla's mother. He suggests that Mutanabbī may have arrived in Baghdad before the summer of 351.

161. See the preceding note.

exchange at the house of Muhallabī. This exchange must have taken place before the 6th of Jumādā II 352/2nd of July 963 and Mutanabbī arrived in Kūfa before the beginning of Sha‘bān 352/end of August 963. A series of meetings could have taken place beginning in the late spring of 352 and ending any time between that date and the 6th of Jumādā II 352, when Muhallabī left Baghdad¹⁶². It is of course easier to accept the story as it is told in the *Mūdiha* if we follow Kiktev’s suggestion, since this would mean that the first meeting could have taken place in the summer of 351, in the months of July, August and September, when the heat is at its worst.

As we have seen, the *Mūdiha* mentions a first meeting at the house of Mutanabbī, and three further meetings at the residence of Muhallabī. The last paragraph (p. 96) of the description of the first session states in a way similar, though much less elaborate, than that of the shorter versions that Ḥātimī had some kind words for Mutanabbī, so that the two parted in good spirits¹⁶³. Those present urge Ḥātimī to commit the

162. The three shorter versions all mention that Ḥātimī became on friendly terms with Mutanabbī and visited him at his house. Assuming that the debate took place in 352, these visits could have been made during a second stay in Baghdad prior to Mutanabbī’s fatal trip to Persia, or perhaps in Jumādā II, Rajab, or Sha‘bān before Mutanabbī’s return to Kūfa. It is easy to imagine that Ḥātimī would have considered this detail worth mentioning in the shorter versions of his account, but that it did not fit in with the account presented in the *Mūdiha*, where subsequent meetings are all but friendly and culminate in Mutanabbī’s early departure.

163. *Mūdiha*, p. 96, lines 4–5: ولم أنهض الا بعد أن راجعت جميلا في
خطابه وأطنبت في تقريره وفي تعفیه أشر عقوبته وفي الالة
جانبي له.

Cf. the shorter version in Bisāṭī’s ed., p. 269, lines 9–11: ورأيت له حق
القدمة في صناعته فطأطأت له كتفي واستأنفت جميلا من
وصفه ونهضت فنهض لي مشيعا الى الباب حتى ركبت وأقسمت
عليه أن يعود الى مكانه.

The text in Badī’ī’s *Ṣubḥ*, p. 142, lines 4–6, has some minor variants (كتفي) .
for (كنفي). The text in Yāqūt is identical. See also the sentence quoted above,
p. 19, note 49.

MS Ambrosiana N.F. F 300, fol. 6a, lines 29–31: ورأيت له حق المقدمة في
صنعه فطأطأت له كنفي واستأنفت له جميلا من وصفه وتقريره
(etc., see above, p. 32).

The Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā‘, p. 268, line 11, reads: ورأيت حق
القدمة في صنعه فطأطأت كتفي واستأنفت له جميلا في وصفه
وتقريره وشكره ونهضت فنهض...

ثم قمت فقام معي مشيعا فأقسمت (etc., see above, p. 19, note 49) عليه حتى رجع ثم وفدت عليه...

The MS Berlin, Peterm. II 228, fol. 44a, lines 4–5 and the India Office Library MS Ar. 3829, fol. 211b, line 9 omit the word *mushayyi‘an*.

discussion to writing which he does by denying himself sleep for several nights. The final paragraph also suggests that Ḥātimī owed the plan for the *risāla* to Muḥallabī and Ibn Fasānjus, who then showed a copy of his work to Mu‘izz ad-Dawla¹⁶⁴. The passage is far from clear. Is Ḥātimī perhaps alluding to one of the shorter versions that comprised only a description of the debate at Mutanabbī’s house? Or does he mean to say that the two dignitaries asked him only for a brief written account? Muḥallabī thereupon insists that there should be a further discussion and that it should take place in his presence. (Mutanabbī had taken part in an earlier discussion in Muḥallabī’s house where his opponent had been the famous Abu ‘l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī.)¹⁶⁵. He orders two scribes to keep accurate records of what is being said and famous scholars, such as Hibatallāh b. al-Munajjim¹⁶⁶ and the poet Ibn al-Baqqāl¹⁶⁷, are invited to attend the meeting. The paragraph ends with a promise by Ḥātimī to his readers that he will, in his account of the subsequent meetings, do justice to some good passages in Mutanabbī’s poetry in which Mutanabbī almost showed himself an innovator, or handled traditional themes with great skill, so that no unfair charges can be made against the poet in future. In his description of the three meetings that followed Ḥātimī hardly lives up to this promise, and it would have been more appropriate as an introduction to the plans he outlines at the end of the book (p. 196) for a second monograph on Mutanabbī.

I shall not attempt to give a detailed account of the debates between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī as presented in the *Mūḍiḥa*, since this can better be done in the context of an article analyzing Ḥātimī’s views on literary theory and his place among earlier and contemporary scholars whose

164. *Mūḍiḥa*, p. 96, lines 15–18: (= المهلبى)
ورسم الوزير أبو محمد (= المهلبى)
والرئيس أبو الفرج محمد بن العباس وإياه خاطبت بهذه
الرسالة وأمره المسموع في نظمها امتثلت وهما كوكبا
المملكة وناظرا الدولة شرحها فشرحتها وأنها الصورة الى
معز الدولة .

165. See above, p. 19, note 49.

166. For Hibatallāh [b. Muḥ. b. Yūsuf] Ibn al-Munajjim see M. Fleischhammer, “Die Banū l-Munağğim”, *Wissensch. Zeitschrift der Martin Luther Universität Halle, Ges. - Sprachw.* XII 3/4, 219–220, note 75. Tanūkhī, *Nishwār*, I, 15 mentions Hibatallāh as a *naḍīm* of Muḥallabī (see index for further references).

167. Ibn al-Baqqāl is characterized by Yāqūt, V, 507–513, as a *naḍīm* and panegyrist of Muḥallabī. Yāqūt has also preserved a tradition according to which Mutanabbī considered Ibn al-Baqqāl the only true poet he met in Baghdad. See also Tawḥīdī, *Mathālib (Akhlaq) al-Wazīrayn*, ¹ pp. 132 and 270, ² pp. 194 and 410; idem, *Imtā’*, III, 190, 195, 213; idem, *aṣ-Ṣadāqa wa-’l-Ṣadiq*, p. 220; Sezgin, *GAS*, II, 592 Wherever it is quoted in full, his name appears as ‘Alī b. Yūsuf, not ‘Alī b. Muḥammad as in the *Mūḍiḥa*.

views he often shares¹⁶⁸. The originality of his work is not in the substance of any of the theories he puts forward, but in his brilliant illustration of these theories and the choice of a most unusual framework. This is especially true of the first debate which offers illustrations of a wide range of aesthetic criteria and rhetorical devices, though the main object is to demonstrate the difference between slavish or clumsy imitation of themes borrowed from other poets and the subtle metamorphosis of borrowed themes which he finds in the work of truly gifted poets. Needless to say that Mutanabbī is accused of being in the first category. Ḥātimī also illustrates, again using Mutanabbī as a target of criticism, that contemporary poets can use only to a limited extent the obsolete vocabulary of the ancients and follow their poetic licenses. Ḥātimī makes no attempt to classify Mutanabbī's poetry from the critic's or from the historian's point of view; yet his comments are perhaps the most convincing analysis by a mediaeval scholar of a post-classical poet's failure to create a style of his own while drawing on the traditions of his classical predecessors of the ancient, the early Islamic, and the early Abbasid periods. Though there is some petty criticism when it comes to pointing out slight grammatical errors or the use of a wrong term, his judgement is often well-founded and one almost ends up feeling that Mutanabbī was, after all, a mediocre poet who was not only lacking in originality, but also had insufficient competence in grammar, lexicography, and rhetoric, and sometimes gave evidence of incredibly bad taste¹⁶⁹. In all of this Ḥātimī relies on what appears to be a profound knowledge of Arabic poetry of all periods and a good background in philology which, he implies, one would also expect to find in an opponent who had not only a reputation as a poet, but had also set up himself as a teacher interpreting his own poetry¹⁷⁰. The discussion is

168. See I. 'Abbās, *Ta'rikh an-Naqd al-Adabī 'ind al-'Arab: Naqd ash-Shi'r* (Beirut 1391/1971), especially pp. 264–270; A. Maṭlūb, *Ittijāhāt an-Naqd al-Adabī fi 'l-Qarn ar-Rābi' li-'l-Hijra* (Beirut 1393/1973), pp. 261–265; W. Heinrichs, *The Hand of the Northwind, Deutsche Morgenländische Ges.: Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Band XLIV, 2 (Wiesbaden 1977), pp. 41–42 and index. Heinrichs draws attention to the similarity between Rummānī, *an-Nukat fi I'jāz al-Qur'an* (ed. M. Khalafallāh and M.Z. Salām in *Thalāth Rasā'il fi I'jāz al-Qur'an*, Cairo n.d.), p. 79, lines 11–12 and Ḥātimī's *Mūdiha*, p. 69, lines 12–13 and p. 92, lines 4–5. See also S.A. Bonebakker, "A Fatimid Manual for Secretaries", *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli* Vol. 37 (N.S. XXVII), 314, lines 4–5 and 9–10. The sentence in *Mūdiha*, p. 92, line 4 should perhaps be read: وكل استعارة لطيفة توجب بلاغة
بيان لا يفهم بالحقيقة فهي غير نائبة منابها. Cf. also *Mūdiha*, p. 25, line 9 and Qudāma b. Ja'far, *Kitāb Naqd ash-Shi'r*, ed. Bonebakker (Leiden 1956), p. 2, lines 11–12 and p. 7, lines 4–13.

169. See for instance the line on p. 123, line 2, of the *Mūdiha* which will be discussed below, p. 49.

170. There is an explicit statement to this effect in the three shorter versions, following a debate on a lexicographical matter in which Mutanabbī is defeated. Bisāṭī's ed., p. 269, lines 3–5: فلما علوته بالكلام قال يا هذا مسلمة اليك

اللغة قلت وكيف تسلّمها وأنت أبو عذرتها ومن نصابها وسرّها
وأولى الناس بالتحقق بها والتوسع في اشتقاقها والكلام
على أفانينها وما أحد أولى بأن يسأل عن لغته منك .

The text in Yāqūt is identical.

Badī'ī, *Ṣubḥ*, p. 141, line 15–p. 142, line 1: فلما علوته بالكلام قال يا

هذا اللغة مسلمة لك فقلت كيف تسلّمها وأنت أبو عذرتها
وأولى الناس بها وأعرفهم باشتقاقها والكلام على أفانينها
وما أحد أولى بأن يسأل عن غريبها منك .

MS Ambrosiana N.F. F 300, fol. 6a, lines 22–25: قال أبو علي فلما علوته

بالكلام قال يا هذا مسلمة لك اللغة فقلت كيف تسلّمها وأنت
أبو عذرتها ومن هو نصابها ويضتها (بجدتها ؟) وأولى
الناس بالتحقيق لها وعنك تكتب ومنك تؤخذ وهذا دليل في
استفهامها والكلام على أفانينها وما أولى أن يسأل عن لغة
منك (sic) .

The text in the Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā', p. 268, lines 4–7:

علي فلما علوته بالكلام قال يا هذا مسلمة لك اللغة قلت
كيف تسلّم وأنت أبو عذرتها ومن هو نصابها ولغتها (sic)
وأولى الناس بالتحقيق بها وعنك تكتب ومنك تؤخذ دليل
الوسع في اشتقاقها والكلام على أفانينها وما أولى أن يسأل
عن لغة منك .

Khafājī, *Rahyḥāna*, p. 427, lines 11–12: فلما علوته بالكلام قال يا هذا

أنا أسلم لك أمر اللغة فقلت أنسلّمها (sic) وأنت ابن بجدتها
فلما علوته بالكلام فقال 3. MS Berlin, Peterm. II 228, fol. 44a, lines 1–3.
يا هذا مسلم اليك أمر اللغة فقلت تسلّمها وأنت ابن نجدتها
(sic).

The India Office Library MS of the *Tadhkira Ṣalāḥiyya*, fol. 211b, lines 7–8 reads *ibn bajdatihā*, but otherwise has the same text.

Cf. also a similar observation in *Mūdiḥa*, p. 63, lines 8–9. Evidence of Mutanabbī's career as a philologist appears in the introduction of the *Kitāb at-Tanbihāt* by his friend 'Alī b. Ḥamza al-Baṣrī (above p. 18, note 46): During his stay in Egypt in 347 Mutanabbī lectured on the *Kitāb al-Maqṣūr wa-'l-Mamdūd* of Ibn Wallād. Abu 'l-Ḥusayn ['Alī b. Aḥmad] al-Muhallabī later claimed to be the author of some of the corrections introduced by Mutanabbī; see 'A. al-Maymanī ar-Rājikūti (ed.), *al-Manqūṣ wa-'l-Mamdūd li-'l-Farrā' wa-'l-Tanbihāt li-'Alī b. Ḥamza* (Cairo 1387/1967), p. 325. A debate between Mutanabbī and Abu 'l-Ḥusayn al-Muhallabī is quoted by Yāqūt, V, 82.

mostly between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī, though occasionally somebody from the audience (for whom Ḥātimī shows no appreciation in the description of the first debate)¹⁷¹ comes to Mutanabbī's aid. Often Mutanabbī is forced to admit the poor quality of a line of poetry, but then tries to save himself by pointing to lines in the same poem that came out better¹⁷². Finally, when Ḥātimī draws attention to an error in prosody, Mutanabbī exclaims (p. 77) that he follows the spontaneous inclinations of his talent and does not care much for established rules, and, a moment later, that even if he committed errors the ancient poets did the same and that the quality of the work of all poets is uneven. This is of course denied by Ḥātimī who considers Mutanabbī's errors to be much more serious. More than once his sarcasm reaches such proportions that one feels he cannot have expressed himself the way he describes it in the presence of his opponent (p. 35):

العارض الهتن ابن العارض الهتن اب
بن العارض الهتن ابن العارض الهتن

“[He is] the abundant raincloud, son of the abundant raincloud, son of the abundant raincloud, son of the abundant raincloud”.

Mutanabbī, he says, must have been conversing with the stars all night long, till morning greeted him, before he succeeded in putting this line together¹⁷³.

It is clear not only from the introduction and the end of this first section of the *Mūdiha*, but also from p. 34, where he addressed the *ra'īs* (Ibn Fasānjus), and from p. 86, where he counters an explanation offered by a Mutanabbī commentator, that Ḥātimī composed the work at a time much later than the date at which the debate actually took place¹⁷⁴.

Moreover, he showers praise on Sayf ad-Dawla (pp. 91–92), which he is unlikely to have done when the Ḥamdānids were still powerful and strong rivalries existed between their dynasty and the Buwayhids.

171. See above, p. 17, note 46.

172. As happens often in Arabic literary criticism in the middle ages, the poem is not examined as a whole, in spite of the critics occasional insistence that the poet should bring coherence to the sequence of themes in his poem. Cf. *Mūdiha*, p. 66, line 15–p. 69, line 2 where Ḥātimī emphasizes that the opening theme should be consistent with the main theme of the poem.

173. In this passage Ḥātimī perhaps addresses a member of the audience who comes to Mutanabbī's help (cf. p. 29, lines 14–15) or, more likely, the *ra'īs* Ibn Fasānjus for whom the *Mūdiha* was written (cf. p. 34, line 11; the words *wa-sawfa ya'tī fīmā ba'du* on p. 35, line 14 which mark the passage as a parenthesis may, of course, be a gloss). The line is repeated on p. 39, line 16 in a context which leaves no doubt that Ḥātimī speaks to Mutanabbī himself and where he criticizes him in a less offensive way. The line is in the commentary of Wāhidī, p. 257; the commentary of 'Ukbarī, IV, 216; and 'Azzām's ed. of the *Dīwān*, p. 158. Still there are numerous instances of insults which Ḥātimī mentions explicitly as part of the debate; see, for instance, p. 17, lines 7–10.

174. See Wāhidī, pp. 52–53; 'Ukbarī, IV, 35–36; and 'Azzām's ed., pp. 29–30 for various attempts to explain the line attacked on pp. 85–86 of the *Mūdiha*.

Mutanabbī is summoned to the next meeting which takes place at the house of Muhallabī (p. 98) and at first refuses to be drawn into the discussion. He yields to Ḥātimī's attempts to put him at ease, but a moment later suffers Ḥātimī's sarcasm when the debate gets under way. He receives some faint support from the son-in-law of Muhallabī, Abū 'Alī al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Anbārī (p. 105)¹⁷⁵. Mutanabbī claims that he knows neither Abū Tammām nor Buḥturī (p. 106), though Ḥātimī has demonstrated, and continues to demonstrate, that Mutanabbī plagiarized these poets¹⁷⁶. But Ḥātimī has also moderate praise for some of Mutanabbī's imitations of Abū Nuwās (pp. 112 and 115). A new element in the discussion is Mutanabbī's assertion that, even if he borrowed from Abū Nuwās, this poet was after all a classic and as such could and should be followed (p. 111). There is again, in Ḥātimī's account of this meeting, a parenthesis (pp. 108–109) where Ḥātimī quotes two lines by Mutanabbī that were apparently not brought up during the discussion. The meeting ends with Mutanabbī attempting to show that Abū Nuwās himself committed *sariqas* (p. 116 ff.). Muhallabī closes the meeting on a note of praise for Mutanabbī (p. 119). Mutanabbī leaves, but the others stay behind and assist Muhallabī in going over the notes that have been made during the meeting. Ḥātimī is honoured and rewarded by Muhallabī. The third meeting again takes place at the residence of Muhallabī (p. 120). Muhallabī's son-in-law, who has also attended the previous meeting and whom Ḥātimī characterizes with manifest contempt as an amateur scholar¹⁷⁷, has made a secret arrangement with Mutanabbī to

175. See below, note 177.

176. The passage seems to correspond to p. 264, lines 3–4 of the shorter version in the ed. of Bisāṭī (= Yāqūt, VI, 514, lines 2–3 and Badī'i, *Subh*, p. 138, lines 2–3). In this last version, as well as in the other short versions represented by the Ambrosiana MS, the Mecca MS, Khafājī's *Rayḥāna*, the Berlin MS, and the India Office Library MS, the passage follows immediately after an attack by Ḥātimī on Mutanabbī in which he accuses the poet of having "corrupted" a metaphor borrowed from Abū Tammām, while Mutanabbī claims that he does not know this poet. The same metaphor appears on p. 90, line 7 of the *Mūdiḥa* as part of Ḥātimī's report on the first debate. In the first debate, however, Ḥātimī accuses Mutanabbī repeatedly of plagiarizing Abū Tammām without Mutanabbī denying that he knew Abū Tammām's work. See also below, pp. 49–50.

177. For Muhallabī's son-in-law, the *kātib* Abū 'Alī al-Anbārī, see Tanūkhī, *Nishwār*, I, 72 and passim (see indexes); Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, II, 124 (both Tanūkhī and Miskawayh give his name as al-Ḥasan). On p. 201 of his ed. of the *Mūdiḥa* (note to p. 120, line 1), Najm suggests, without quoting any arguments to support his suggestion, that Ḥātimī confuses Abū 'Alī with another son-in-law of Muhallabī, Abu 'l-Faḍl al-Abbās b. al-Ḥusayn ash-Shirāzī (see *Tajārib*, II, 181; Busse, p. 238 and passim), who became vizier after the death of Mu'izz ad-Dawla. I have not been able, however, to establish the date of Anbārī's death, and it is possible that Najm found evidence indicating that he died prior to the discussion. Tanūkhī also quotes Anbārī in his *Faraj* ¹, I, 103, 122, 177, ², 108, 127, 184. He gives his full name there as Abū 'Alī al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥ. b. Mūsā al-Anbārī and confirms that he was the son-in-law of Muhallabī.

bring up for discussion lines by Mutanabbī which are unquestionably original. Muhallabī who holds his son-in-law in high esteem and refuses to see his shortcomings agrees to the meeting. Abū Saʿīd as-Sīrāfī (d. 368/978), ʿAlī b. ʿĪsā ar-Rummānī (d. 384/994), Abū ʿl-Faṭḥ al-Marāghī, Abū ʿl-Ḥasan al-Anṣārī, ʿAlī b. Hārūn [al-Munajjim] (d. 352/963), and Abū ʿl-ʿAlā ʿṢāʿid b. Thābit [an-Naṣrānī]¹⁷⁸ also attend the meeting. Mutanabbī at first refuses to answer ʿAlī b. Hārūn on a question of usage, and Muhallabī turns to Abū Saʿīd¹⁷⁹, ʿAlī b. ʿĪsā, and Ḥātimī for an answer. ʿAlī b. Hārūn attacks other lines by Mutanabbī which he considers blasphemous. Mutanabbī again refuses to answer and Ḥātimī tries to humour him by offering an unusual interpretation of a line by Majnūn which contains a similar blasphemy and could therefore be cited as an excuse. Anbārī, Muhallabī's son-in-law, challenges (pp. 123–124) those present to prove that certain examples from the poetry of Mutanabbī, a list of which has been drawn up by him in advance, do not demonstrate Mutanabbī's originality, but the challenge is answered only by Ḥātimī. What follows is not essentially different from the pattern of the two previous debates, except that now three famous scholars, Abū Saʿīd as-Sīrāfī, ʿAlī b. Hārūn al-Munajjim, and ʿAlī b. ʿĪsā ar-Rummānī take part in the discussion¹⁸⁰. Of these three only ʿAlī b. Hārūn clearly opposes Mutanabbī. Abū ʿl-Faṭḥ al-Marāghī and Abū ʿl-Ḥasan al-Anṣārī do not take part in the discussion, while ʿṢāʿid briefly attempts to defend Mutanabbī. The list of examples which has been collected by Muhallabī's son-in-law to prove Mutanabbī's originality serves, of course, as a framework for yet another discussion on the *sariqa*, but the question now receives particular attention from the theoretical point of view. Ḥātimī not only introduces us to a set of terms that are not frequently used in other mediaeval works on literary theory and criticism (and may be very old)¹⁸¹, but is also more specific about his own theory (p. 149 ff. in reply to p. 143). His ridicule of Mutanabbī assumes grotesque proportions when, in the above mentioned passage at the beginning of the debate (pp. 122–123), he reports that ʿAlī b. Hārūn

178. See p. 142 where ʿṢāʿid defends Mutanabbī and is identified by Ḥātimī as “at that time a deputy of Muhallabī”. According to Tanūkhī, *Faraj* ¹, II, 149, ², p. 383, he served as deputy to several viziers, and this is confirmed by Miskawayh, *Tajārīb*, II, 146 and 243. See also Tanūkhī, *Nishwār*, I, 70 and indexes; Tawḥīdī, *Imtāʿ*, III, 213; and Busse, pp. 239, 301, and 463–464. ʿṢāʿid had earlier attended the meeting described in ʿAbdalqādir al-Baghdādī, *Khizāna*, II, 355. For Marāghī and Anṣārī see above p. 38–39, note 152.

179. There may be a lacuna, since the answer of Abū Saʿīd is not reported.

180. This calls to mind a statement by Ḥātimī in the *Taqrīʿ al-Hilbāja* (above, pp. 10–12) that at the court of Sayf ad-Dawla he was considered the equal of Sīrāfī and Rummānī, see Yāqūt, VI, 503, lines 14–15.

181. This appears from a comparison between the *Mūdiḥa* and Ḥātimī's *Ḥilya* (see below, pp. 54–55 and *Materials*, p. 19). I am preparing an article on this terminology.

questions Mutanabbī about three lines of poetry which he considers blasphemous. In the last of these three lines the poet describes how young women suckle draughts of saliva from his lips and that this action is sweeter in his mouth than the profession of monotheism (*tawḥīd*)¹⁸². Mutanabbī is unable to come up with an answer and this gives ‘Alī b. Hārūn occasion to whisper in Ḥātimī’s ear that Mutanabbī has bad gums and foul breath.

The meeting ends with Muhallabī urging his scribes to note down carefully what has been said during the debate and Mutanabbī complaining about the lack of hospitality demonstrated by the fact that he is being invited to meetings where he is not well received¹⁸³. He rises and leaves in anger, is brought back by Muhallabī, but does not stay much longer. Muhallabī schedules a meeting which will be devoted to the poetry of Abū Tammām and Buḥturī (p. 156).

A week goes by without Mutanabbī being summoned or coming of his own accord. When he finally appears (according to Ḥātimī again prompted by false promises on the part of Abū ‘Alī al-Anbārī) he apologizes for his absence. Ḥātimī asks him to recite one of his poems; Mutanabbī reluctantly agrees and is soon stopped by Ḥātimī when he comes to a line which Ḥātimī believes to be a *sariqa* from Mutanabbī’s “two models” (*min imāmayhi*) who are then identified as Abū Tammām and Buḥturī (pp. 157–158). During the second debate Mutanabbī has denied that he has ever heard of these two poets¹⁸⁴; now he merely asks, as a rhetorical question, who these two *imāms* may be whose work he has stolen and whom, by so doing, he pretends to ignore. He then attacks Abū Tammām’s poetry often claiming that Abū Tammām, in his turn, was plagiarizing as he had previously argued when accused of stealing from Abū Nuwās. Ḥātimī does not deny this, but maintains that Abū Tammām in borrowing themes from others proved himself equal if not superior to his models. Ḥātimī also shows that Mutanabbī was influenced by Abū Tammām to such an extent that an ugly feature in Abū Tammām’s work may also appear in Mutanabbī’s (p. 174–175). Mutanabbī however persists in criticizing Abū Tammām which prompts Ḥātimī to observe that Mutanabbī must indeed have studied Abū Tammām’s work and memorized its themes (*ma‘ānī*) if he is able to point

182. See Wāḥidī, p. 30; ‘Ukbarī, I, 315 (cf. U. Rizzitano, “Un commento di Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’... ad alcuni versi di al-Mutanabbī”, *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, XXX [1955], 210–211); ‘Azzām’s ed., p. 13. ‘Ukbarī quotes interesting attempts to explain away these offensive passages. See also ‘Ukbarī, I, 154–155 and II 341; ‘Alī b. ‘Abdal‘azīz al-Jurjānī, *al-Wasāṭa*, ed. M. A. Ibrāhīm (Cairo 1370/1951), p. 63.

183. In spite of moderate praise which Ḥātimī bestows on a line by Mutanabbī (p. 134, line 14) and a compliment which Mutanabbī addresses to Ḥātimī (p. 130, line 2–3).

184. See above, p. 47.

to so many errors in his work (p. 177)¹⁸⁵, a remark that clearly refers back to the second debate of the *Mūḍiḥa* (p. 106) rather than the beginning of the fourth (p. 157). There are some further illustrations of the terminology of plagiarism (p. 182 ff. and p. 193). Muhallabī grows impatient with what he considers Mutanabbī's unfair criticism of Abū Tammām and urges Ḥātimī to offer additional evidence of Abū Tammām's originality (p. 187) and later invites him to do the same for Buḥturī (p. 191–192) while Mutanabbī stubbornly persists in his earlier line of reasoning. Muhallabī himself takes part in the discussion, as do 'Alī b. 'Īsā ar-Rummānī (p. 189) and Abū Sa'īd as-Sīrāfī (pp. 190 and 192). In the final paragraph Ḥātimī observes that Mutanabbī controlled his anger out of respect (*hayba*) for the vizier¹⁸⁶, left heading straight for Kūfa, and was never seen again in the house of Muhallabī. Reflecting on

185. Some of the lines criticized by Mutanabbī (e.g. p. 160, line 5; p. 163, line 3; p. 164, line 10; p. 168, line 15; and p. 169, line 11) appear on p. 264 of the shorter version in the ed. of Bisāṭī (and thus as part of the first debate which took place at Mutanabbī's residence) immediately following Mutanabbī's denial that he knows the work of Abū Tammām (cf. above, p. 47, note 176). Ḥātimī's reply follows on p. 265 and is very similar to *Mūḍiḥa* p. 177, lines 3–8. Ḥātimī tacitly accepts some of Mutanabbī's criticism, but then quotes other lines the excellence of which, he feels, is such that the examples quoted by Mutanabbī should be forgiven, see *Mūḍiḥa*, p. 161, lines 4–5; p. 162, lines 1–2, 5–6, and 16; p. 169, line 15; and p. 170, lines 5–6, 9, and 11, which correspond to pp. 265–268 of the shorter version in Bisāṭī's ed. The same discussion appears in the Ambrosiana MS, fols. 5a–6a, in the Mecca MS in the ed. by Shammā', pp. 265–267 and, in a much more concise form, in Khafājī's *Rayḥāna*, pp. 425–426, the Berlin MS, fol. 43b, and the India Office Library MS, fol. 211a–b.

186. Page 195, lines 1–2: فبهر أبا الطيب ما أوردته واحتبست عارضته
وعقل لسانه عن الجواب وكاد يشغب لولا أن هيبة الوزير أبي
محمد ملأت قلبه (لولا تخوفه من عاقبة تشغبه). (variant:)

Cf. the shorter version in Bisāṭī's ed., p. 268, lines 9–12: فبهره مما أوردته

ما قصر عنان عبارته وحبس بنيات صدره وعقل عن الاجابة
لسانه وكاد يشغب لولا ما تخوفه من عاقبة شغبه وعرفه من
مكاني في تلك الأيام وأن ذلك لا يتم له فما زاد على أن
قال قد أكثرت من أبي تمام ...

The text in Yāqūt is identical to that in Bisāṭī's ed.; Badī'ī's *Ṣubḥ* has minor variants. The text of this passage in the Ambrosiana and Mecca MSS is corrupt, but probably was not much different from that in Bisāṭī, Yāqūt, and Badī'ī (it clearly

reads (امكاني في تلك الأيام for مكاني من خدمة السلطان

The version in Khafājī's *Rayḥāna*, the Berlin MS, and the India Office Library MS does not contain any suggestion that Ḥātimī enjoyed the protection of Muhallabī or any other dignitary.

this Ḥātimī finds, according to one version of this final paragraph, that another reason prompting Mutanabbī to flee to Kūfa was the ridicule to which he had been subjected by the notorious satirist, Ibn al-Ḥajjāj (d. 391/1001), and that this happened in spite of the latter's despicable character and lack of education. In a second version of the final paragraph which appears on the margin of the unique manuscript of the *Mūdiha*, Ḥātimī indicates that the insult by Ibn al-Ḥajjāj preceded "this encounter" between himself and Mutanabbī, by which he probably means the first debate at Mutanabbī's residence¹⁸⁷. In this second version on the margin he also speaks of Ibn al-Ḥajjāj in rather respectful terms, which would suggest that the version in the text was written at a time when Ibn al-Ḥajjāj was not dangerous¹⁸⁸. Ḥātimī's account ends with a brief but interesting comment: Mutanabbī fled from Baghdad to Kūfa, and from there to Persia to seek the protection of 'Aḍud ad-Dawla and Ibn al-'Amīd; but he was only partly successful in his poems in praise of these dignitaries. His poetic vein, which he had exhausted in his earlier poems on Sayf ad-Dawla, no longer served him and he was forced to undertake the return journey to 'Irāq during which he met his death. Ḥātimī ends the *Mūdiha*, as we have seen, with a promise that he will write a work that will not only deal with Mutanabbī's failures, but will also do justice to his good poetry, especially his panegyrics. The principles of the book will be fairness and "justice which one cannot transgress" (*al-ḥaqq alladhī lā yasa' ta'-addih*). This promise is reminiscent not only of the introduction of the "Second *Risāla Ḥātimiyya*" which I have discussed earlier, but also of the end of the account of the first debate in the *Mūdiha* itself where Ḥātimī states his intention to point out those places where the excellence of some of Mutanabbī's work is apparent, an intention which he can hardly be said to have realized in his account of the three remaining debates.

There is every reason to consider the *Mūdiha* a new and extended version of the three shorter versions represented by the text published in Bisāṭī's edition (which is also quoted in Yāqūt and in Badī'ī's *Ṣubḥ*), the Ambrosiana and Mecca manuscripts, and the text quoted in Khafājī's *Rayḥāna* (which also appears in manuscripts in Berlin and in the India Office Library). Both Ḥātimī's account of the second debate¹⁸⁹ and his account of the fourth¹⁹⁰ contain elements of the shorter version, which means that they are no longer part of the disputation at Mutanabbī's

187. According to the account in 'Abdalqādir al-Baghdādī, *Khizāna*, II, 355, this attack took place on the day following Mutanabbī's second encounter with Muhallabī, during which he had been expected to recite a panegyric in praise of the vizier, see above, p. 19, note 49.

188. According to Yāqūt, VI, 501, Ḥātimī himself was a victim of Ibn al-Ḥajjāj's satires.

189. See above, p. 47, note 176; cf. also *Mūdiha*, p. 104, lines 14–15 and p. 105, line 11 which correspond to p. 259, lines 2–3 and p. 260, line 14 in Bisāṭī's ed.

190. See above, p. 50, note 185.

residence, but appear in a new setting, the meetings at the palace of Muhallabī. It is worth noting that the third debate contains the most interesting part of Ḥātimī's theory of the *sariqa* and also puts Muhallabī's son-in-law in a far more unfavorable light than the fourth (which otherwise opens in a way very similar to that of the third); one could therefore argue that it contained elements of the discussion that had earlier been omitted out of respect for Muhallabī, or that it was added later to add perspective to the *sariqa* discussion in the fourth debate. But the fact that Ḥātimī does not hesitate to place scenes from the debate in the shorter versions in a different context raises serious questions about the historicity of the second and fourth debates as well. It is, moreover, hard to believe that Mutanabbī should have allowed himself to be publicly humiliated on four different occasions. The inconsistencies in the account of Mutanabbī's reaction to Ḥātimī's accusation that he plagiarized Abū Tammām which have been pointed out earlier (above, pp. 47 and 49) also strongly suggest that the three debates at the house of Muhallabī were invented and tacked on to the original account which accordingly had to be considerably modified. It would be consistent with the practices of mediaeval Muslim scholarship to publish several very different versions of the same work and, moreover, quite in keeping with Ḥātimī's high opinion of his own personality as a scholar to relate this most glorious moment in his career more than once, changing the wording of his description of certain scenes and elaborating or abbreviating at will. One could imagine that sometime between 365/975 and 370/980, over fifteen years after his meeting with Mutanabbī, Ḥātimī took up the idea of writing one final version for which – one could suggest – he had been promised a reward by Ibn Fasānjus¹⁹¹. Both Muhallabī and Mu'izz ad-Dawla had been dead for many years and the actual circumstances of the confrontation between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī, if they were still remembered, had lost much of their significance. One could go further and suggest that the text in Khafājī's *Rayḥāna*, the Berlin manuscript, and the manuscript in the India Office Library is the oldest of the four versions, since it contains all the essential elements of the other versions except those parts of the story that involve Muhallabī and Mu'izz ad-Dawla in the rivalry between Ḥātimī and Mutanabbī. It would then be possible to assume that the shorter version published by Bisāṭī and the version in the Ambrosiana and Mecca manuscripts were composed long after the debate took place. Together with the *Mūdiḥa* they could be seen as attempts to demonstrate Ḥātimī's close relations with some of the most prominent political figures of the

191. Cf. Ibn an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, ed. G. Flügel (Leipzig 1871–1872), p. 76 on the various stages that led to the final redaction of the *Yāqūt fi 'l-Lughā* of Ghulām Tha'lab. Cf. also the marginal notes quoted in Najm's ed. of the *Mūdiḥa* which show that even of the *Mūdiḥa* there was more than one version in existence.

middle of the fourth century¹⁹². One wonders if Ḥātimī's career had perhaps been a failure in the sense that he had dedicated several books to influential people, in addition to trying his luck with panegyric poems, without receiving the reward he had hoped for and without finding a patron who would support his work during an extended period¹⁹³. But what should one think of Ḥātimī's plans to write a comprehensive work that would do full justice to Mutanabbī? Did he give up this plan though he still mentions it at the end of the *Mūḍiḥa*?¹⁹⁴. Or did he feel that he could make good his promise by putting together a collection of parallels between Aristotle and Mutanabbī? The material I have collected so far supports, I feel, this last interpretation¹⁹⁵. The "Second *Risāla Ḥātimīyya*" obviously enjoyed great popularity which accounts for the innumerable alterations, cuts, and additions which it suffered, including the omission of the introduction which, as we have seen, can be interpreted as linking the first *risāla* to the second. That Ḥātimī had some appreciation for the work of Mutanabbī is clear from the repeated assurances to that effect which he expresses himself or puts into the mouths of others, in spite of the acrimonious tone which characterizes all four versions of the debate. The "Second *Risāla*", with or without its introduction, is therefore consistent with Ḥātimī's ambivalent attitude towards Mutanabbī; there is no good reason to deny its authenticity, unless further evidence is discovered. By this I do not mean to say that in this tedious recital of parallels Ḥātimī used his talents as a critic and historian to full advantage; as an example of Mutanabbī criticism it cannot stand comparison with the *Mūḍiḥa* or with one of the shorter versions of the debate. The *Mūḍiḥa* is a far more interesting work, since in spite of the display of learning which must have been its essential purpose, Ḥātimī manages to hold the reader's attention and never lets him lose sight of the original framework of the *risāla* which is a grotesque picture of Mutanabbī's character and habits and a violent attack on certain aspects of his work. Yet one must agree with I. 'Abbās¹⁹⁶ that it would be wrong

192. Cf. *Mūḍiḥa*, p. 96, lines 18–19 and p. 119, lines 18–19 where he finds it necessary to emphasize the honors he received from Mu'izz ad-Dawla and Muhallabī. This suggestion should however be weighed against the evidence from the *Yatīma* which I have discussed above, pp. 9 and 36.

193. As further indications of Ḥātimī's failure to win recognition one could consider: the confusion in the *Yatīma* over the identity of Ḥātimī, and the scarcity of information about Ḥātimī's poetry which does not seem to have been collected in a *Dīwān*.

194. Cf. also the end of the description of the first session (above, p. 43); one could argue that this passage originally marked the end of the *risāla* and was reworded at a later date to serve as an introduction to the description of the three additional sessions.

195. The evidence from Ṣafadī's *Nuṣṣa* (above, p. 36) which would suggest that one of Ḥātimī's books on Mutanabbī was lost is, I feel, too vague to be taken into account.

196. I. 'Abbās, *Ta'rikh an-Naqd al-Adabī 'ind al-'Arab: Naqd ash-Shi'r* (Beirut 1391/1971), p. 248.

to underestimate the importance of the *risāla* as an attempt to show the affinity between Arabic versions of Greek wisdom literature and the work of one of the most prominent of Arab poets.

Authors of mediaeval treatises on literary theory and criticism sometimes quote from the *Ḥilyat al-Muḥāḍara* by Ḥātimī. The *Ḥilya* records numerous definitions of figures of speech by early philologists from the second, third, and fourth centuries. These definitions were often elaborated or served as a basis for discussion even when they were not specifically quoted and the *Ḥilya* therefore offers a means of identifying views on literary theory that were used as models by Ibn al-Mu‘tazz (d. 296/908), Qudāma b. Ja‘far (d. after 320/932), and their contemporaries; in addition to this the *Ḥilya* offers quotations from these two authors themselves. I have traced many of these definitions in a study published in 1975¹⁹⁷. The *Ḥilya* is not, as one would expect, itself a work on literary theory, but rather an anthology of poetry with short sections dealing with the figures of speech, various forms of plagiarism, and other matters that would interest the literary critic (the chapters on these questions are intended primarily as selections of examples). A work dealing specifically with literary theory entitled *Kitāb al-Ḥālī wa-l-‘Āṭil* is quoted by Ḥātimī himself in the *Ḥilya*. It seems to have met with little response and has not survived; as far as I know the only author who claims to have used the book was Usāma b. Munqidh¹⁹⁸, though it is not impossible that it was used by a few others who do not refer to it by name¹⁹⁹. Not only the definitions, but also many quotations in the anthological sections of the *Ḥilya* are presented in the form of traditions and provided with a complete *isnād*. I had originally planned to include in the present study an attempt to throw more light on Ḥātimī’s biography by identifying, on the basis of these *isnāds*, the individuals who had been Ḥātimī’s teachers in Baghdad and perhaps elsewhere. I reluctantly decided to postpone such an attempt for the time being, for two reasons: the existence of a third unpublished manuscript of the *Ḥilya* which I had not used for my study and the likelihood that a complete edition of the text would be available in a not too distant future. At the time I was preparing my study on rhetorical terms in the *Ḥilya*, I knew only of two manuscripts preserved in the Qarawiyyīn Library in Fez. A note in the *Liste de*

197. *Materials for the History of Arabic Rhetoric from the Ḥilyat al-Muḥāḍara of Ḥātimī*, *Annali dell’Istituto Orientale di Napoli*, Supplemento no. 4 – vol. 35, fasc. 3, Naples 1975 (referred to in this study as *Materials*).

198. Usāma b. Munqidh, *al-Baḍī‘ fī Naqd ash-Shi‘r* (above, p. 19, note 51), p. 8.

199. See *Materials*, pp. 14–16, 20, and 27. ‘Alī b. Khalaf, the author of the *Kitāb Mawādd al-Bayān*, a work dating from the fifth/eleventh century, complains that the *Ḥālī* was not available to him, see Bonebakker, “A Fatimid Manual for Secretaries” in *Annali dell’Istituto Orientale di Napoli*, Vol. 37 (NS XXVII), p. 310. The same complaint is voiced by Ibn Abi ‘l-Iṣba‘ (d. 654/1256), see *Materials*, p. 15.

*manuscripts arabes ... exposés à la Bibliothèque de l'Université Quaraouiyine à l'occasion du onzième centenaire*²⁰⁰, etc. led me to believe that there existed a third manuscript and this expectation was confirmed during a recent visit to the Qarawiyyīn. The manuscript consists of a collection of loose leaves held together in a portfolio which bears the call number 248. It appears to cover part of the second volume and the third volume, and does not, as far as I can see, contain any of the passages published in my study, except for the paragraph on pp. 27–30²⁰¹. The handwriting is a beautiful, clearly legible, Eastern *naskhī*. Many of the pages have been severely damaged and have been covered with transparent paper to prevent further deterioration. The librarian, Mr. Muḥammad Bencherifa, informed me that a complete catalogue of the Qarawiyyīn prepared by the former librarian, the late ‘Ābid al-Fāṣī, was ready and would soon be published. For this reason I saw no point in attempting to prepare an accurate description. He also informed me that an edition of the *Ḥilya* was being prepared by an Iraqi scholar. I therefore also decided to discontinue my attempts to reconstruct Ḥātimī’s biography on the basis of the two manuscripts I had examined earlier²⁰². The promised edition, if it did not already contain a study of the *isnāds*, would greatly facilitate my attempts which so far had not yielded important results.

The earliest author to offer an extensive list of Ḥātimī’s writings appears to have been Yāqūt. The only other comprehensive list known to me

200. Ministère de l’Éducation Nationale, Royaume du Maroc-Imprimerie de l’Étoile (Rabat 1960), p. 53, last line.

201. One of the pages in the portfolio reads as follows: آخر الثاني بعون الله

ونصره وله الحمد etc. ويتلوه في الثالث ان شاء الله هذا

هذا باب يريدون أن يجيئوا بالشيء. The break between the second and the third volume therefore corresponds to that in the MS 590 of the Qarawiyyīn (see *Materials*, p. 5). I also found the chapter headings

باب كشف المعنى وابرازه بزيادة منه تزیده (see *Materials*, p. 9 under 76a) and

باب كشاف المعنى وابرازه بزيادة منه تزیده (see p. 11 under 97a). As far as I know the MS has no date.

The folios corresponding to *Materials*, pp. 27–30 are severely damaged. I noted the following variants some of which are obvious errors:

p. 28, line 9: الراجز for آخر.

p. 29, line 2: وقدمه , for وقدميه .

p. 29, line 4: يلبس for يلبس .

p. 30, line 1: قصيره , after والأشأب شجر .

p. 30, line 11: جاريتني as in my text.

202. The quality and the state of preservation of the two Maghribī MSS, especially the MS 590, leaves much to be desired (see *Materials*, pp. 1–5 and *passim*) and a thorough comparison of this last MS with the MS 2934 on the basis of photographs alone is hardly possible.

appears in Suyūṭī's *Bughya*. Though it is difficult to form an opinion of the range of Ḥātimī's interests on the basis of these titles alone, there can be little doubt that his chief concern was literary criticism, and that a few books dealt with lexicography and grammar²⁰³. None of these are known to have survived, either in their original form, or as extensive quotations or digests, except for the autobiographical note from the *Taqrī' al-Hilbāja* which I have mentioned earlier²⁰⁴. The survival of the *Ḥilya* in two Maghribī manuscripts (one of which has a marginal note indicating that a small portion of the book had already circulated in Spain before the rest arrived), Ibn Ḥazm's (d. 456/1063-4) recommendation of "the books of Abū 'Alī al-Ḥātimī" as manuals on poetry²⁰⁵, the quotations from the *Ḥilya* in the *Maqāmāt* commentary of Sharīshī (d. 619/1222), and in the commentary on the *Maqṣūra* of Ḥāzīm al-Qarṭājannī by Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Gharnāṭī (d. 760/1358)²⁰⁶ tend to show that Ḥātimī enjoyed a considerable reputation in Spain, though I have not found any mention of the author or of his books in the numerous collections of biographies and bibliographical information (*fahāris*) from that country.

203. Abu 'l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Muḥ. al-Jurjānī ath-Thaqafī, *al-Muntakhab min Kināyāt al-Udabā' wa-Ishārāt al-Bulaghā'* (Cairo 1326/1908), p. 88, fourth line from the bottom, quotes from the *Amālī* of Abū 'Alī al-Ḥātimī al-Lughawī, a work which I have not found listed elsewhere.

204. A similar work of satirical character may have been the *Kitāb al-Miḡhsal (?) wa-hiya ar-Risāla al-Bāhira fī Khīṣāl Abi 'l-Ḥasan al-Battī* (Yāqūt, VI, 503, lines 3–4). One can only speculate on the character of this work; the Qāḍī Abu 'l-Ḥasan Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Battī (d. 403 or 405/1012 or 1014) is chiefly known for his role as a secretary to al-Qādir during the latter's retreat to al-Baṭīḥa shortly before his accession to the throne (see Busse, p. 690) and his correspondence on behalf of al-Qādir with the Buwayhid Bahā' ad-Dawla. He was famous for his witticisms, but apparently made himself many enemies, see *Ta'ār. Bagh.*, IV, 320; Bākhazrī, *Dumyat al-Qaṣr*, ed. 'A. M. al-Hulw (Cairo 1388/1968), I, 321–322; Sam'ānī, *Ansāb* (above, p. 14, note 35), II, 82; Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam* (above, p. 14, note 35), VII, 263; Yāqūt, I, 233–241; Yāqūt, *Mu'jam al-buldān* (above, p. 14), I, 334b; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil* (above, p. 37, note 145), IX, 175; Ṣafadī, *Wāfi* (above, p. 14, note 35), VII, 231–234; idem, *Nuṣrat ath-Thā'ir 'ala 'l-Mathal as-Sā'ir* (above p. 36, note 141), p. 296.

205. *At-Taqrīb li-Hadd al-Manṭiq*, ed. I. 'Abbās (Beirut 1959), p. 207.

206. See *Materials*, p. 18, note, and index.

P. 9:

That Ḥātimī indeed had a son who distinguished himself as a poet appears from vol. VII, p. 372 of Ṣafadī's *Wāfi bi-'l-Wafayāt* (*Das Biographische Lexicon des Salāḥaddīn Ḥalīl ibn Aibak aṣ-Ṣafadī*, Teil 7, ed. I. 'Abbās, Wiesbaden 1969) where there is an entry for Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Muẓaffar Abū Ṭālib b. Abī 'Alī al-Ḥātimī al-Baghdādī. Ṣafadī mentions that this Abū Ṭālib al-Ḥātimī left a *Dīwān* and [a collection of] correspondence. He quotes two fragments of poems, but offers no further particulars.

P. 22 (bottom) – p. 25:

To the manuscripts listed on these pages should be added Princeton, Yahuda 761 and 542 (Mach's catalogue no. 4050). The first manuscript was written in 870 and has 93 parallels. The introduction corresponds to the type mentioned under *A* on pp. 27–28. The second manuscript is part of a *majmū'a*. One or two pages from the introduction are missing and only the last sentence appears on fol. 142a; it may have belonged to the types under *A*, *B*, or *D*. Since there are only 42 parallels it is possible that some more pages are missing. After the colophon there are two more parallels, copied in the same hand, which the scribe says he found in another manuscript. There is no date. Both manuscripts have the title *Risāla Ḥātimīyya*.

The reproduction on the cover of this publication was taken from Yahuda 761. I am indebted to the Princeton University Library for kind permission to use their microfilm for this purpose.

P. 36 and note 141:

See also Ibn Abi 'l-Iṣḥā', *Badī' al-Qur'ān*, ed. Ḥ. M. Sharaf (Cairo 1377/1957), pp. 10–11. Ibn Abi 'l-Iṣḥā' mentions two *risālas* on Mutanabbī's borrowings one of which dealt with "his elegant borrowings".

P. 56 (cf. pp. 7–8):

As far as I know, no description exists of the *Waq'at al-Adham* in any of the biographies of Ḥātimī. But the title appears in a list of works on literary theory and criticism from which Ibn Abi 'l-Iṣḡa' drew material for his *Badī' al-Qur'ān* (see p. 11, line 1).

INDEX OF PERSONAL NAMES

The names of authors of biographies of Ḥātimī and of collections that contain quotations from Ḥātimī's works, as well as the names of most contemporary editors and authors of reference works, have been omitted from this list.

- 'Abbās, I. 16 n. 43, 27 n. 88, 44 n. 168, 53
 al-'Abbās b. al-Ḥusayn ash-Shirāzī, Abu 'l-Faḍl 37 n. 145, 47 n. 177
 'Abdal'azīz al-Maymanī ar-Rājkūtī 40 n. 155
 Abdalqādir al-Baghdādī 18 n. 46, 40 n. 155, 48 n. 178, 51 n. 187
 Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī 12
 Abu 'l-'Atāhiya 27 n. 90
 Abū Bakr al-Khwārizmī 9
 Abū Ḥayyān at-Tawḥīdī 11 n. 15, 13
 Abu 'l-Faḍl b. al-'Amīd (vizier) 38 n. 152, 51
 Abu 'l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī (author of the *Aghānī*) 12, 19 n. 49, 43
 Abu 'l-Faṭḥ al-Marāghī 38, 48
 Abu 'l-Faṭḥ b. al-'Amīd (vizier) 38 n. 152
 Abu 'l-Ḥusayn 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Muhallabī 45 n. 170
 Abū Nuwās 47, 49
 Abū Sa'id as-Sirāfī 48, 50
 Abū Taghlib (Ḥamdānīd) 11 n. 16
 Abu 't-Tayyib al-Lughawī 12
 Abū Tammām 47, 47 n. 176, 49–50, 50 n. 185, 52
 Abū 'Umar az-Zāhid (Ghulām Tha'lab) 10 n. 14, 52 n. 191
 'Aḍud ad-Dawla (Buwayhid) 11 n. 16, 38, 51
 Aḥmad, Munīr-ud-Dīn 16 n. 43
 Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Battī, Abu 'l-Ḥasan (Qāḍī) 8 n. 5, 56 n. 204
 Aḥmad b. Muḥ. b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Muẓaffar al-Ḥātimī al-Baghdādī, Abū Ṭālib b. Abī
 'Alī (son of Ḥātimī) *Addenda*
 al-Akhfash, 'Alī b. Sulaymān 12
 al-Akhṭal 27 n. 90, 32
 'Alī b. 'Abdal'azīz al-Jurjānī 49 n. 182
 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Muhallabī, Abu 'l-Ḥusayn 45 n. 170
 'Alī b. al-'Abbās, Abū Muḥ. (brother of Ibn Fasānjus) 38
 'Alī b. al-Muḥassin at-Tanūkhī, Abu 'l-Qāsim 6
 'Alī b. Ḥamza al-Baṣrī 18 n. 46, 19 n. 49, 40 n. 155, 45 n. 170
 'Alī b. Ḥārūn al-Munajjim 48–49
 'Alī b. 'Isā ar-Rummānī 44 n. 168, 48, 50
 'Alī b. Ka'b al-Anṣārī, Abu 'l-Ḥasan 38, 48
 'Alī b. Khalaf 20 n. 58, 54 n. 199
 'Alī b. Sulaymān al-Akhfash 12

al-Anbārī, Abū 'Alī al-Ḥusayn (or al-Ḥasan) b. Muḥ. b. Mūsā (son-in-law of Muhallabī) 39, 47, 48, 49, 52
 al-Anṣārī, Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Ka'b 38, 48
 Aristotle, Aristāṭālīs, Aristū, Aristotelian 19, 20 n. 57 and 58, 24, 25 n. 80, 28, 28 n. 93, 29 n. 95, 30, 33, 34 n. 133, 53
 al-Badī'ī, Yūsuf 39
 al-Baghdādī, 'Abdalqādir 18 n. 46, 40 n. 155, 51 n. 187
 Bahā' ad-Dawla (Buwayhid) 56 n. 204
 al-Battī, Abu 'l-Ḥasan Aḥmad b. 'Alī (Qāḍī) 8 n. 5, 56 n. 204
 Blachère, R. 17 n. 46, 18 n. 48, 19 n. 49, 28 n. 92, 32 n. 109, 39, 39–40 n. 155
 Brockelmann, C. 19 n. 50, 24 n. 76
 al-Buḥturī 47, 49–50
 Busse, H. 38 n. 148
 Bustānī, A. 5, 22 n. 64, 29
 Ghulām Tha'lab (Abū 'Umar az-Zāhid) 10 n. 14, 52 n. 191
 Ghurayyib, G. 27 n. 90
 al-Ghuzūlī (author of the *Maṭālī' al-Budūr*) 11 n. 16
 al-Hamadhānī (author of the *Takmilat Ta'rikh at-Ṭabarī*) 38 n. 148
 al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Muhallabī, Abū Muḥ. see al-Muhallabī
 Heinrichs, W. 44 n. 168
 Hibatallāh b. al-Munajjim 43
 al-Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad b. Sa'dān, Abū 'Abdallāh (vizier) 11
 al-Ḥusayn b. Maḥmūd b. al-Ḥusayn al-Kātib al-Baghdādī, Abū 'Abdallāh 30, 34
 al-Ḥusayn (or al-Ḥasan) b. Muḥ. b. Mūsā al-Anbārī, Abū 'Alī (son-in-law of Muhallabī) see al-Anbārī
 Ibn 'Abbād, aṣ-Ṣāḥib (vizier) see aṣ-Ṣāḥib Ibn 'Abbād
 Ibn Abi 'l-Iṣba' 54 n. 199, *Addenda*
 Ibn al-'Amīd, Abu 'l-Faḍl (vizier) 51
 Ibn al-'Amīd, Abu 'l-Faḥ (vizier) 38 n. 152
 Ibn al-Athīr, Ḍiyā'addīn (author of the *Istidrāk*) 20
 Ibn al-Athīr, 'Izzaddīn (author of the *Kāmil*) 38 n. 148
 Ibn al-Baqqāl, 'Alī b. Yūsuf or 'Alī b. Muḥ. 43
 Ibn al-Ḥajjāj 36, 51
 Ibn al-Munajjim, Hibatallāh 43
 Ibn al-Mu'tazz 54
 Ibn an-Nadīm 52 n. 191
 Ibn Durayd 10, 11
 Ibn Fasānjus (or Fasānjas), Abu 'l-Faraj Muḥ. b. al-'Abbās b. Mūsā ash-Shīrāzī (vizier) 9, 32, 35, 37, 38, 43, 46, 46 n. 173, 52
 Ibn Jinnī 39, 40 n. 155
 Ibn Khālawayh 12
 Ibn Nubāta (author of *Sarḥ al-'Uyūn*) 20
 Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya 27 n. 90
 Ibn Sa'dān, Abū 'Abdallāh al-Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad (vizier) 11
 Ibn Sukkara al-Hāshimī 36
 Ibn Ṭabāṭabā al-'Alawī 27 n. 90
 Ibn Wakī' 20 n. 57
 Ibn Wallād (author of the *K. al-Maqṣūr*) 45 n. 170
 'Izz ad-Dawla (Buwayhid) 38 n. 152
 Jarīr 27 n. 90
 al-Jurjānī, Abu 'l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Muḥ. ath-Thaqafī 56 n. 203
 al-Jurjānī, 'Alī b. 'Abdal'azīz 49 n. 182
 Kabir, M. 38 n. 148
 Karatay, F.E. 21 n. 59, 26 n. 85
 Kiktev, M.S. 41, 41 n. 160, 42

al-Kindī, Tāj ad-Dīn Abu 'l-Yumn 39 n. 155
 Le Strange, G. 18 n. 46
 al-Marāghī, Abu 'l-Faṭḥ Muḥ. b. Ja'far 38, 48
 Maṭlūb, A. 44 n. 168
 al-Mubarrad, Abu 'l-'Abbās Muḥ. b. Yazīd 31
 al-Muhallabī, Abu 'l-Ḥusayn 'Alī b. Aḥmad 45, n. 170
 al-Muhallabī, Abū Muḥ. al-Ḥasan b. Muḥ. (vizier) 9, 12 n. 27, 16, 18, 18 n. 48, 19 n. 49, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39–43, 47–52, 53 n. 192
 Muḥ. b. al-'Abbās b. Fasānjus (or Fasānjas), Abu 'l-Faraj see Ibn Fasānjus
 Muḥ. b. 'Abdallāh (or 'Ubaydallāh) as-Salāmī, Abu 'l-Ḥasan 11 n. 16 and 19
 Muḥ. b. Aḥmad al-Jarjārā'ī (deputy vizier) 13
 Muḥ. b. al-Ḥusayn al-Yamanī, Abū 'Abdallāh 27
 Muḥ. b. Ibrāhīm b. Makkī b. Muḥassin al-Qayrawānī 25 n. 77
 Muḥ. b. Ja'far al-Marāghī, Abu 'l-Faṭḥ 38, 48
 Muḥ. b. Yaḥyā aṣ-Ṣūlī, Abū Bakr 16 n. 43
 Muḥassad (? son of Mutanabbī) 32
 Mu'izz ad-Dawla (Buwayhid) 16, 18, 31, 32, 33 n. 120, 35, 36, 37, 43, 52, 53 n. 192
 al-Munajjim, 'Alī b. Hārūn 48–49
 an-Nābigha 11 n. 16
 an-Nājim, Abū 'Uthmān Sa'd (or Sa'id) b. al-Ḥasan 20 n. 58, 34 n. 133
 Najm, M.Y. 5, 47 n. 177
 Qābūs b. Wushmagīr, Shams al-Ma'ālī (Ziyārid) 7, 13
 al-Qādir (caliph) 7, 8 n. 5, 13, 56 n. 204
 Qudāma b. Ja'far 44 n. 168, 54
 Radīf, Ṣ. 11 n. 16
 ar-Rājkūtī, 'Abdal'azīz al-Maymanī 40 n. 155
 Rescher, O. 19 n. 50, 22 n. 64, 25 n. 78–80, 26, 29
 ar-Riyādī 24
 Rizzitano, U. 18 n. 46
 ar-Rummānī, 'Alī b. 'Īsā 44 n. 168, 48
 Sābūr b. Ardāshīr (vizier) 13
 Sa'd (or Sa'id) b. al-Ḥasan an-Nājim, Abū 'Uthmān 20 n. 58, 34 n. 133
 aṣ-Ṣafadī 36, 53 n. 195, *Addenda*
 aṣ-Ṣāḥīb b. 'Abbād (vizier) 11 n. 16, 13, 27, 36 n. 141
 Ṣā'id b. Thābit an-Naṣrānī, Abu 'l-'Alā' (deputy vizier) 48
 as-Salāmī, Abu 'l-Ḥasan Muḥ. b. 'Abdallāh 11, n. 16 and 19
 Ṣāliḥ b. 'Abdalquddūs 27 n. 90
 Sayf ad-Dawla (Ḥamdānid) 11, 11 n. 16, 12, 13 n. 28, 16, 18 n. 47, 39, 39–40 n. 155, 41, 46, 48 n. 180, 51
 Sayyid, F. 21 n. 59, 25 n. 77
 Sezgin, F. 15, 21 n. 59, 22, 22 n. 64–65, 25 n. 77 and 79, 26, 34
 Shams al-Ma'ālī, Qābūs b. Wushmagīr (Ziyārid) 7, 13
 Shalabī, A. 16 n. 43
 as-Sirāfī, Abū Sa'id 48, 50
 aṣ-Ṣūlī, Abū Bakr Muḥ. b. Yaḥyā 16 n. 43
 Tāj ad-Dīn Abu 'l-Yumn al-Kindī 39 n. 155
 at-Tanūkhī, Abu 'l-Qāsim 'Alī b. al-Muḥassin 6
 at-Tawḥīdī, Abū Ḥayyān 11 n. 15, 13
 'Ubaydallāh b. Aḥmad an-Naḥwī, Abu 'l-Faṭḥ 12
 'Ubaydallāh b. Ṭāhir 20 n. 57
 al-'Ukbarī 19 n. 52, 20, 39, 40 n. 155, 49 n. 182
 Ūnūjūr (Ikhshīdīd) 11
 Usāma b. Munqidh 54
 al-Wāḥidī 39
 Yāqūt (author of the *Mu'jam al-Buldān*) 18 n. 46
 Zambaur, E. de 38 n. 148

